

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom
all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXIII

AUGUST, 1931

No. 134

EDITORIAL

THE USE OF CREEDS

FROM time to time in recent weeks the view has been expressed in the public Press that the Creeds are an obstacle to the attendance of the laity at worship; that subscription to them deters many men who feel called to the Ministry from being ordained; and that the Church's life would be enriched by the addition of a further Creed on lines suggested by the advocates of the "Grey Book" a few years ago. We do not agree with any of these opinions; but the expression of them affords, perhaps, an occasion for considering afresh the nature and use of the Creeds as we have them. It should be remembered that in no part of Christendom are the Creeds so frequently repeated in public worship, and therefore so generally known to the people, as in the Church of England.

The Creeds are in the first instance summaries of the Church's testimony to a definite Revelation which God has given men of Himself. The fact that in the early centuries they grew from very elementary to more complex forms does not affect that primary point; new questions were asked, both by simple folk and by theologians, and new answers had to be given; but the new answers all came from the original "Word of God," of which the Church was the appointed witness and guardian. And the point is important. It reminds us that Christianity is not simply "religion," but a particular and definite religion. Nothing could be clearer from the Scriptures than that religion is not necessarily *per se* good; it may be false and immoral, as was the case with the Baal-worship surrounding the Israelites in Canaan, with the teaching of the "false prophets" against whom Jeremiah protested, and with the paganism which stirred the anger of St. Paul. What is good is not religion *tout simple*, but true religion; not that men should believe in a god, but that they should believe in the one true God; and even the con-

ception of Yahweh, the one true God, passes in the Old Testament through a continuous process of purification until the full light of God's glory shines out in the revelation of the New.

Secondly, this revelation of the one true God is given through history; and particularly in the historical Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in His life, death, and resurrection. The Word of God, that is to say, is a word given through, and finally embodied in, fact. Christianity thus affords a complete contrast to the Mystery Religions; for though Attis and Osiris had their myths, no one ever suggested that they had any history. St. Paul, summarizing the requirements of salvation, not only demands that men shall confess with their mouths "the Lord Jesus," but also that they shall believe in their hearts "that God hath raised him from the dead" (Rom. x. 9). This historical element of the Gospel was, in short, its very heart and core. For that reason alone, the collection of edifying texts which certain Modernists desire to have authorized for public recitation in Church is in no true sense a Creed and should not be called one.

And, thirdly, this history is public. It has its mysteries; the facts to which the Church bears witness all of them contain an element of "meta-fact" (or, as the Russians call it, "meta-history"), which comes from their contact with the supernatural order. But Christianity is not esoteric. Take the Mystery Religions out of history, and you make no odds; but take out Christianity, and you have deprived history of its chief unity and meaning. The march of events ceases to have a criterion, and becomes unintelligible.

Christianity, therefore, is a religion which rests upon particular, historical, and public events, and contains a definite revelation of God given in facts which are meant to be open to all. It claims, that is to say, to be a body of truth; and, as such, it can and must be expressed in statements or propositions. The necessity of Creeds thus follows from the nature of Christianity itself; without them (as can be seen only too clearly in American Protestantism) our religion loses its character. What is involved in the recitation of the Creeds, or in subscription to them, is a further question to which perhaps we shall have opportunity to return in a later number. What we are concerned to contend for at the moment is that the Creeds are not an afterthought of our religion, but of its very essence, and could not be set aside without evident apostasy.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CHURCH IN MODERN RUSSIAN THEOLOGY (II)

TRAGEDY entered the development of the world through original sin, which was a catastrophe not only for man, but for the whole of creation. Creation "was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same" (Rom. viii. 20). God's plan of salvation consisted naturally in the restitution of man, in whom the image of God, though not destroyed completely, was disfigured. The restitution is really a new, a second creation of the world—not, however, by the power of God, but by His sacrificing love: "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son" (John iii. 16) for its salvation. The life of the Church in the world after the Fall becomes a preparation for this restitution of mankind, especially (though not limited to them) among the chosen people in the Old Testament Church. Before the new heavenly Adam could descend to earth an ascent of creation to God was needful, according to the true inner norm of human nature. This necessitated a new step in the appearance of the Church in creation, so that mankind could be restored to its primordial state in the Church, and this was accomplished in the person of the Holy Virgin, who is named by the Church "the new Eve." The first Eve manifested disobedience to God; the new Eve said: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it unto me according to thy word" (Luke i. 38). She appeared as a true bride, a personal representation of the Church in mankind, and, still more, in the whole of creation.

The Orthodox Church venerates our Lady as the Mother of God; we glorify her not only as the Ever Virgin (*αἰμαρθένος*), but also as the Queen of Heaven and Earth, of all creation, higher than cherubim and seraphim and all angels; the first of all humanity and of all creation. She was chosen and sanctified by the Holy Ghost from her birth and childhood; at the Annunciation (Luke i. 35) when the Holy Ghost came upon her, and at Pentecost when she assisted in Sion's Hall. According to the faith of the Orthodox Church, the Assumption of our Lady was her complete glorification: she was not only raised from the dead by her Son, but also taken into heaven and sits on the right hand of her Son. In this figure the idea is conveyed that in the Mother of God the aim of the creation is accomplished—the deification (*theosis*) of creation. Human nature in Christ is fully penetrated by the life of God, and this is called in theological language *περιχώρησις*, or *communicatio idiomatum*.

But the human nature of Christ, His soul and body, were given Him by the Blessed Virgin; she is His Humanity personified. The relation of the Mother and the Child—as both are commonly represented in icons of the Mother of God—is not exhausted by the birth alone, but is continued throughout eternity. As this personal representative of the humanity of Christ, she is saved, sanctified, and glorified in the highest degree, as was predestined in the creation of mankind. In her, “Wisdom is justified of her children” (Matt. ii. 9) and really enjoyed by this daughter of man, who is also the daughter of God (*θεόπαις*). In her there is already accomplished the fulness (*πλήρωμα*) in the created world, and no further completion is possible. Therefore she is present at her Son’s right hand at the Last Judgement. She herself is not judged, but she implores His mercy for others.

She is the dwelling-place of the Holy Ghost. He personally abides and reveals Himself in her. The Holy Ghost is not incarnated as the Son, who unites in His person both natures, divine and human. The Holy Ghost without such a personal incarnation abides in sanctified men and penetrates them. And this fullest, perfect penetration becomes a revelation of the person of the Holy Spirit in the person of the Holy Virgin. She, in her person and nature, in her whole existence, is completely penetrable to the Holy Ghost, and so is His personal revelation, just as the Son is revealed in Jesus Christ. She is the Bearer of the Holy Ghost and therefore the representation of the holiness of the Church, the Bride of Christ. To her belong the figures of the Song of Songs and of the Apocalypse; she is the Bride and Wife of the Logos, the woman clothed with the sun. As a spiritual centre of humanity she is the Mother of all mankind. In receiving St. John the Evangelist at the Cross she receives as her adopted Son the whole human race. Thus she is the heart of mankind, the merciful Mother of all.

As this personal representative of the Church the Mother of God has a cosmic significance. The man is head of creation (*μικροκόσμος*), uniting in himself all creation, and the Mother of God, the heart of humanity, naturally becomes the cosmic centre also. She is glorified in hymns and icons as the Queen of all elements, of all nature, of all life on the earth. This cosmic power belongs to the Church inasmuch as it is not only a society, but also the principle of creation. And if the Mother of God contains in herself the power and strength of the Church, as the saintliest of saints, it is natural that she has superiority over nature. In her person the whole of creation is led to the throne of Almighty God and raised to heaven. She is in this sense the personal Wisdom of God and the Glory of creation.

In her person the solemn prayer of Christ to His Father for the glorification of mankind is accomplished. She received the glory which her Son had with the Father before the world was, and as the Church consists of men and of angels, she, as bearing in Herself its highest measure of holiness, is higher than angels. In the person of Our Lady we have a personal revelation of the Church, not as a society, visible or invisible, but as eternal being, the real principle of all creation, of humanity, of the Wisdom of God. The Church is God's Sophia, and the Blessed Virgin is that personified revelation of Sophia in creation, as her Son is personified uncreated Wisdom: "Christ, the power of God and the Wisdom of God" (1 Cor. i. 24). It is characteristic that the feast-days of Holy Sophia in the Russian cathedrals are celebrated on the feast-days of the Holy Virgin. It is also interesting that the feast-day of Holy Sophia in the Greek Church in London is celebrated on the Day of Pentecost. On the other hand, the cathedral of the Holy Sophia in Byzantium was dedicated—as far as it is possible to ascertain—to our Saviour, evidently as the personified, uncreated Wisdom of God.

The Church as the divine basis of creation is revealed in the history of the world and of mankind. Essentially the six days of creation are the creation of man, who is a "microcosmos" or, according to the expression of the Holy Fathers, "a world drawn together." The physical world—mineral and chemical—is properly nothing but an external body of man. His life is a perpetual exchange of substances. Man has the capacity of eating matter and thus incorporating it into his body. And he has the capacity of working, of reorganizing and conforming the world to his needs. He surmounts space, he becomes more and more omnipresent, and consequently all the earth—and, further, all the universe—becomes his body, being possessed in an increasing degree by the efforts of his labour. In this sense economic progress and technical development mean the "humanification" of creation, and in that process the divine Wisdom, which has its true image in mankind, is realized in creation through the intimate penetration of man into the physical world. One of the most important differences between man and animals is that the latter have no history and repeat themselves from generation to generation, while man has the history of the whole of mankind, and his life is unified thereby. What is the chief content and general idea of this history? Human history is essentially nothing other than a history of the Church as the inner principle of human development. The centre of this history is the Incarnation of Christ, and all the history before it is the preparation for this Birth, the genealogy of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the

Mother of God. This preparation was made in the Chosen People, in the Jewish Church. But it was not limited by this, because in the pagan world an analogous process of preparation was taking place. The Christian Church united Jew and Pagan under the sign of the Cross. The history of mankind becomes, firstly, the history of the spreading of the Christian Church, and, secondly, the revealing of Christ's power in humanity. It may be questioned whether there is any real history after Christ. Does not Scripture declare that the last time has come and the end is at hand? Was it not the dominant opinion of the primitive Church that Jesus was coming according to the prayer: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus"? It seems as if the history of mankind after Christ would be empty of content. Such was the general feeling in the primitive Church. Admittedly that was one-sided, a mistaken historical judgement, and this mistake became self-evident. Time continued, there was no end, and on the contrary history began. The last days were prolonged for many ages, for an indefinite time. What meaning, what content can they have? The Old Testament had a clear idea of the philosophy of history based on the expectation of the Messiah, the promised King of Israel. This idea was generalized by the prophets. But it was limited by the coming of the Messiah. Thereafter there remained only the last judgement and world catastrophe. But the Christian idea of history has its own content. The process of history is certainly a tragic struggle between Christ and Antichrist, but this conflict must be passed through. History is not an unimpeded victory of Antichrist who vanquishes the world without any struggle. Such an eschatology of panic, though widespread among Christians, is unworthy of Christianity. The history of the "latter times" is not merely negative but a positive process of the manifestation of the power of Christ in the world. There is the *future* in Christian history, and Christ says about the revelation of the Comforter: "He will show you things to come" (*τὰ ἐρχόμενα*). And about these *ἐρχόμενα* our Saviour says: "Verily, verily I say unto you, He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do" (John xiv. 12). There exist *works* which are to be done by mankind for the sake of the name of Christ, by His power—a positive task or vocation of Christian people in history. In sacraments and through the grace of the Holy Spirit, Christ, to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth, gives to mankind His help, not only preparing their souls for eternal life, but enabling them to accomplish earthly works as well. The Incarnation itself includes both sides, human and divine, and the end of this world

with its transfiguration in the general resurrection has not only the divine but the human side also. The essential task of Christian history is to prepare for the end; and thus history passes into apocalypse and eschatology. This historic way is creative, claiming from mankind the fullest effort. The image of God which is man's possession includes creative power. Of course man cannot create from nothing as God does, but he is able to carry out God's purposes in the world. Man is an artist and a worker in the universe. Through his creative mediation the world is transformed according to its destiny. Man participates in its transformation and prepares it for the second advent. This process has its own method, symbolized in the Apocalypse and the other prophetic books, though they are not yet fully understood in their bearing on history.

But not all the future could fully be revealed in the prophetic books. There are some manifestations of the creative character of men which could not be prophesied, because they appertain to man's creative liberty. The sons of God have to accomplish the will of God by their own means, because children are free. Prophetic books cannot, therefore, reveal the whole future. Their purpose is rather education or warning; they do not exclude a place for human freedom and creativity. This creative life of mankind has no outward limits; it has only an inward law of fulness, the revelation of the Church in the world, the Wisdom of God appearing to man. That revelation can include within it all true achievements of culture consonant with the original destiny of man. Yet two kingdoms are being developed in history: *civitas Dei et civitas diabolica*. The created world belongs to God and to the children of God, and not to the usurper who became king of this world for a limited time. What should be the end of this historical development? Is it even possible to show it? It cannot be a task limited to this earthly life, because the life of the Church, according to the Apocalypse, is completed in both worlds by angels and men together. This age is separated from the future by the world's last catastrophe. The historical process is infinite, having no inner end in itself. It could be therefore only interrupted or checked by the end of this world. But then history would be the preparation for a future age, a living bridge between present and future. Therefore the significance of the Church must be conceived on the greatest possible scale. A vision of a woman clothed with the sun (or the new revelation of the Church) must be seen before history can end. And this gives an inner meaning to all the historical achievements of mankind as the development of its gifts in the name of Jesus Christ. Perhaps by the guidance of the Holy Spirit generations which

are nearer to the end will see the direction and bounds of history better and more clearly than we can see them now. They will find thereby greater ability to pray: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus"—and this prayer will be heard by God. The most impressive episode in the struggle between the forces of good and evil in history is the earthly reign of the saints with Christ after the "first resurrection"—the millennium. It is quite natural that such symbolism should appear merely abstract; it has to be given content by the creative efforts of mankind. Man remains free in his creative task. He is seeking for aims and methods for its accomplishment. We can therefore define the general trend of human history as being the revelation by man of the fulness of his humanity. No capacity of man can remain undeveloped, nothing can remain ambiguous.

Γινώθι σεαυτόν—know thyself through all the experience of history and all creative efforts. Man must be a participant in God's work, for he has to prepare the world for further development in its transfiguration. It must be no mechanical or magical event, no *deus ex machina*, because it has to be performed not *by* humanity but *through* humanity and *in* humanity. Human history cannot be merely a futile and senseless path to an inevitable sorrowful end, preparatory to the triumph of antichrist. It has a positive purpose which must be fulfilled by mankind itself. History must pass over into the kingdom of glory and transfiguration, must be a real, not imaginative, historical progress towards the kingdom of God. The final achievement of mankind in that progress cannot be determined before the end of history. A great Russian thinker, Fedoroff, tried to define the ultimate goal of history. This may seem either a foolish idea or prophetic daring, but it must impress both the mind and the imagination. He calls his doctrine the "philosophy of common work." The Christian people who are the sons of mankind must become the sons of God and attain control of the forces of nature, subjecting them to God's purpose of resurrection. By doing this through human skill they become the true sons of God, and Christ will aid human efforts by the grace of the Holy Ghost. Thus the kingdom of God will be accomplished in human victory over death through the Son of Man, Jesus Christ. If man does not do this, Christ will raise the dead Himself, but unto judgement and condemnation. The transition from human history to eschatology is imminent according to this scheme, and the resurrection itself will differ according to the actions of the sons of men in history. Fedoroff's work is a paradoxical attempt to find a final meaning in history which is true to the nature of the Church.

Let us repeat briefly what is the nature of the Church for the modern Russian Orthodox theologian. Firstly, it is, according to the definition of the catechism, a society of men united by the hierarchy of apostolic succession, by common teaching and by the practice of the sacraments. This existence of the Church in time is only a revelation and realization of the divine, eternal principle of the Church as God's Wisdom. It is the divine ground of the world and the real meaning of human history, through which the Church takes possession of creation till God becomes all in all. Further, the doctrine of the Church combines the principles of cosmology, anthropology, soteriology, sociology, and eschatology. The Church is the highest reality in the world and human life, and after the full accomplishment of the cosmic process there will remain nothing apart from the Church. The heavenly Jerusalem, in which Christ Himself abides amongst men, descends from heaven to earth. This life of humanity in Christ is perfected by the Holy Ghost, and the life of the Church in this sense is a continuous Pentecost. Thus the doctrine of the Church is essentially related to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, revealed in the Church. The first eight centuries of the Christian Church were occupied in finding dogmatic formulas for our faith in Christ our Saviour; their dogmatic task was christological. Now we are occupied with the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter. There is a new trembling in Christian hearts, a new expectation; and the Wisdom of God, the Holy Sophia, which was understood at first by Christian thought as in some degree identical with the Logos, with Jesus Christ, is now related more definitely to the Blessed Virgin or to the Holy Church.

Today humanity is feeling new creative forces, new possibilities of working for the kingdom of God. The Comforter, according to the words of Christ, will "show us all things," and it seems as if the unknown future is being gradually disclosed. The future belongs to creative humanity on its way to the kingdom of God, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who, according to an ancient tradition transmitted to us by Gregory of Nyssa, is directly identified in the Lord's Prayer with the kingdom of God. The Church, which is the Holy Spirit within us, must include all human life and sanctify all human creative activity. It must be all in all, and not only a little part of the life of humanity. This great task demands new inspiration and power, but we must not be afraid in the face of it. We are Christians; and to us is spoken the word of the great apostle: "Quench not the Spirit. Despise not prophesyings" (1 Thess. v. 19-20).

SERGIUS BULGAKOV.

THE IDEA OF OBLATION IN THE EARLY LITURGIES

IN what senses do the ancient liturgies speak of an offering made by man to God in the Holy Eucharist? There are four possible senses: first, the gifts presented at the Offertory; second, the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving"; third, the offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies"; and fourth, the sacrifice of Christ. The first and second senses might be taken as symbolical of the third; does, then, this meaning of oblation, which is so prominent in the Anglican rite, appear in the ancient liturgies? And what of the fourth sense? How can man offer to God that which is essentially the sacrifice that God Himself has made? For Christ is *Agnus Dei*, God's Paschal Lamb, as contrasted with the many paschal lambs offered by men. Yet clearly the sacrifice of Christ lies at the very centre of eucharistic oblation.

The materials for the following study have mostly been gathered from Hans Lietzmann's invaluable work, *Messe und Herrenmahl*,* a book which, by printing together the texts of the various sections of the eucharistic prayer from the different liturgies, performs the same service for students of liturgy as the Gospel Synopses for students of the Synoptic Gospels. With Lietzmann's theory of eucharistic origins I am not here concerned; it was, however, certain features of his interpretation of the ancient prayers of oblation that originally provoked the writing of this paper.

THE OFFERTORY.

The offering of the gifts by the people must have been an exceedingly imposing feature in the ancient service. All who were to communicate—that is, broadly speaking, till the fourth century, the whole multitude of the faithful—brought their gifts of bread and wine, just as in St. Paul's day it appears that all brought their food with them. The loaves and the wine for the Eucharist were taken from the offered gifts. There is the story of the Roman lady in the days of Gregory the Great who smiled just as she was about to receive Communion, and explained afterwards to St. Gregory that she had recognized in the species of bread which she was about to receive a piece

* *Messe und Herrenmahl, eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie*, by Hans Lietzmann. Marcus und Weber, Bonn, 1926.

of the loaf which she herself had baked.* Abbot Herwegen points out that this Offertory Procession provides the explanation of the mosaics in the basilica of St. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna above the arcading on either side of the nave. On one side is a procession of male saints laying their crowns at the feet of Christ the King; on the other a line of women saints, led by the Magi, offering to the infant Christ in His Mother's arms. "These two processions are a counterpart to the Offertory Procession of the faithful. As in the church below the men and women who are yet pilgrims on earth bring their gifts to the altar, so above is depicted the fulfilment in the splendour of heaven, the glorification of the church of Ravenna in adoring union with Christ."†

An Offertory prayer from the Liturgy of St. Mark helps to make the picture clear:

"The sacrifices of those who offer, their oblations, their thank-offerings, do Thou, O God, receive at Thy holy celestial immaterial altar of incense (for an odour of a sweet smell, *Coptic text*), into the mighty heavens, by the ministry of Thy archangel: the offerings of those who offer much or little, in secret or publicly, of those who would offer but have not, and of those who have made their offerings here this day: as Thou didst receive the gifts of Thy righteous Abel, the sacrifice of our father Abraham, the incense of Zacharias, the alms of Cornelius, the two mites of the widow; so receive their offerings, and grant unto them, in return for corruptible things, incorruptible; for earthly things, heavenly; for temporal things, eternal."‡

Lietzmann must surely be right in connecting the mention of the heavenly altar with that of the incense. Liturgical language, he says, in its creative vigour always represents concrete images; and the prayer for the acceptance of the gifts at the heavenly altar was originally suggested, not by the bread and wine, which evidently remain in their place on the altar, but by the clouds of incense ascending to the roof. The idea shapes itself into the thought of the double movement, the ascent of man's oblation, gifts, and prayers to the throne of the Most High, and the corresponding descent of the Holy Spirit; typical instances are the Offertory prayer from the Liturgy of St. Basil, which we shall quote lower down, and the *Supplices te rogamus* of the Roman Canon: "We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, bid these (things) to be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy heavenly altar in the sight of Thy divine Majesty; that

* From Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus*, p. 87.

† *Kirche und Seele: Die Seelenhaltung des Mysterienkultes und ihr Wandel im Mittelalter*, by Dr. Ildefons Herwegen, Abbot of Maria Laach, p. 34. A lecture, published by Aschendorff, Münster-in-W., 1928.

‡ Lietzmann, p. 91 f. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 129.

all we who by partaking at this altar receive the holy body and blood of Thy Son may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace."

We may also note that the prayer from *St. Mark* illustrates another common feature of Offertory prayers—the mention of the oblations of Old Testament saints. We shall quote another instance later, and another is to be found in the mention of Abel and Melchizedek in the *Supra quæ* of the Roman Canon; this section of the Canon is therefore without doubt based on an old Offertory prayer.*

The bracketing of the Christian Offertory with the Old Testament sacrifices implies that the gifts were regarded as in a true sense sacrificial offerings; and this thought is found clearly expressed as early as Irenæus. Dr. Brilioth points out that it "is part of his (Irenæus') whole view of the sanctity of the material creation; that which God has created is not unfit to be offered to Him. 'We offer to Him that which is His own, thereby declaring the unity of the material and the spiritual. For as the bread which comes from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God (*percipiens invocationem Dei*), is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, which receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have hope of immortality. . . . 'The hallowing of the creature' is his key-phrase, which he uses both of the Incarnation and of the Christian sacrifice of praise."†

But the whole structure of the liturgies shows that the oblation of the gifts was no more than the preliminary to the central sacrificial act. It stands at the threshold of the *missa fidelium*; it forms the gateway leading to the Holy of Holies. In depth, mystery, richness, the act of worship that follows throws it altogether into the shade.

THE OBLATION OF THE CHURCH.

Lietzmann, however, seems to think that in some parts of the Church there existed during the early period a form of service in which there was no thought of an oblation beyond the offering of the gifts. He seeks to discern, behind the extant form of the anaphora of Serapion, the traces of a primitive form of the Egyptian liturgy, which, like the form in the *Didache*, contained no recital of the Institution.‡ This is part of his general theory of a primitive non-Pauline type of Eucharist, standing broadly in contrast with the Pauline type represented

* See Lietzmann, pp. 89 ff., 101, 119.

† Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, p. 45. Quotation from Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, IV. xviii. 5.

‡ Lietzmann, p. 193.

by the anaphora of Hippolytus. We shall not attempt to deal with his theory in detail, but only to suggest that there is one whole side of the Christian idea of oblation which he leaves out of account. The passage in *Serapion* is as follows, beginning with the end of the *Sanctus*: "Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Full is the heaven, full is also the earth of Thy excellent glory, O Lord of powers. Fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation (τῆς σῆς μεταλήψεως). For to Thee we have offered (aorist) this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering (ταυτὴν τὴν ζῶσαν θυσίαν, τὴν προσφορὰν τὴν ἀναίμακτον). To Thee we have offered this bread, the likeness of the body of the Only-begotten." Then follows: "This bread is the likeness of the holy body, because the Lord Jesus Christ, in the night that He was betrayed . . ."; words which Lietzmann thinks did not belong to an earlier form of the Egyptian rite.*

Our immediate question is, What is "this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering"? The suggestion leaps to the mind that they are a quotation from Rom. xii. 1: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice (θυσίαν ζῶσαν), holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service (τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν)"; and so the "living sacrifice" of *Serapion's* formula is the self-oblation of the Church to God through Christ, through the sacrifice of Christ which is celebrated in the sacrament.

But we must set out some further parallels.

First, from the εὐχὴ τῆς προσκομιδῆς, the Offertory prayer in the Liturgy of St. Basil: Accept us "that we may be worthy to offer to Thee this reasonable and bloodless sacrifice (τὴν λογικὴν ταυτὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν) for our sins and the ignorances of the people; which do Thou receive at Thy holy celestial immaterial altar for an odour of a sweet smell, and send down upon us the grace of Thy Holy Spirit. Look upon us, O God, look upon this our service (λατρείαν), and accept it, as Thou didst accept the gifts of Abel, the sacrifices of Noah, the whole burnt-offerings of Abraham, the ministry of Moses and Aaron, the peace-offerings of Samuel."† Note here, first, the mention of the heavenly altar, and of the Old Testament Saints, as in the Offertory prayer from *St. Mark*; second, the reminiscence of Rom. xii. 1; and third, the agreement with *Serapion* in the term "bloodless offering."

Next, we will take the epiclesis from the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom: "Also we offer to Thee this reasonable and bloodless service (τὴν λογικὴν ταυτὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν), and we beseech and ask and pray: Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon

* Lietzmann, p. 186 ff.

† *Ibid.*, p. 82 f. Brightman, p. 319.

us and upon these gifts lying before Thee, and make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ, changing it by Thy Holy Spirit, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ, changing it by Thy Holy Spirit, that it may be to those who partake for cleansing of the soul, for remission of sins, for fellowship of Thy Holy Spirit, for fulness of the Kingdom, for boldness towards Thee, not for judgment or condemnation."* Here we have an independent quotation of Rom. xii. 1, again associated with the word "bloodless"; the sacrifice which is offered to God includes, therefore, the Church's self-oblation through Christ.†

But let us hear the idea expounded by St. Augustine: "The whole redeemed City itself—that is, the congregation and society of the saints—is offered as a universal sacrifice to God by the High Priest, who offered even Himself in suffering for us in the form of a servant, that we might be the body of so great a Head. For this form of a servant did He offer, in this He was offered; for in this He is mediator and priest and sacrifice. And so when the Apostle exhorted us that we should present our bodies as a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing to God, our reasonable service, and that we be not conformed to this world but reformed in the newness of our mind, to prove what is the will of God, that which is good and well-pleasing and complete, which whole sacrifice we ourselves are. This is the sacrifice of Christians: 'the many one body in Christ.' Which also the Church celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, familiar to the faithful, wherein it is shown to her that in this thing which she offers she herself is offered."‡

With this in mind let us go back to the anaphora of Hippolytus, which, as we now know, dates from the end of the second century, and ask whether we have not now the clue to the meaning of its "vague" epiclesis. We must see the text both in Latin§ and in English:

Et petimus, ut mittas spiritum
tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctæ
ecclesiæ, in unum congregans des
omnibus qui percipiunt sanctis in
repletionem spiritus sancti ad con-
firmationem fidei in veritate, ut te
laudemus et glorificemus per puerum

And we pray Thee to send Thy
Holy Spirit upon the oblation of Thy
holy Church, and gathering them
together in one give to all the faith-
ful who partake, unto fulfilment
with Thy Holy Spirit for the con-
firmation of faith in truth, that we

* Lietzmann, p. 69. Brightman, p. 329.

† Is it not possible that in the *Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ* of the Roman Canon, *servitutis* may represent *λατρεία*, just as in the following section *rationabilem* assuredly represents *λογική*?

‡ *De civ. Dei*, ix. 6. Quoted from Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, i. 123 f.

§ Lietzmann, p. 80.

tuum Iesum Christum, per quem tibi gloria et honor, patri et filio cum sancto spiritu in sancta ecclesia tua nunc et in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

may praise and glorify Thee through Thy Servant Jesus Christ, through whom glory and praise be to Thee, Father and Son with the Holy Spirit, in Thy holy Church now and for evermore. Amen.

It is usual to assume, as Lietzmann assumes, that "the oblation of Thy holy Church" means the sacred elements. If so the epiclesis is certainly vague, indefinite, and elliptical. But when the oblation is taken to be the Church's own self-offering in the act of Communion, the prayer immediately becomes definite, clear, and precise.

This interpretation throws much-needed light on the otherwise perplexing phrase in the epiclesis of the Syrian liturgies: "Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts." Why "upon us"? We have quoted the epiclesis of *St. Chrysostom*; may it not be said that this developed form represents a particularizing of the "vague" epiclesis of *Hippolytus*? It specifies the means by which the prayer of *Hippolytus* is fulfilled—namely, the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, and the gift given in Communion. Through this gift of grace the Church, united with Christ, is herself offered up to do the will of God; hence it is natural that the epiclesis should lead up to a comprehensive intercession for the Church, of which a peculiarly beautiful example is that of *St. James*.

Finally, we must return to the first epiclesis of the Egyptian liturgies, which occurs immediately after the *Sanctus*. We have already quoted from *Serapion*: "Fill this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation. For to Thee we have offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering." We have noted the constant association of the "bloodless offering" with the "living sacrifice" of Rom. xii. 1, and the meaning is clear. The Jewish sacrifices were associated with the slaughter of an animal, and the victim was external to the worshipper; but in the Christian sacrifice there is no slaughter, and the worshippers themselves are offered up and become part of the sacrifice.

Lietzmann quotes also an Egyptian papyrus fragment: "Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Fill us also with the glory which proceeds from Thee, and vouchsafe to send down Thy Holy Spirit on these creatures, and make the bread the body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the cup the blood of the new Covenant." Lietzmann thinks that under Syrian influence the word "us" has come to be substituted for "this sacrifice," and so this epiclesis has lost its original

* Lietzmann, p. 74.

meaning. But is it not possible that in altering "this sacrifice" to "us" the compiler believed himself to be simply giving the sense of his exemplar in other words?

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

It needs now to be emphasized that the conception of the self-oblation of Christians to God, which we have seen emerging in various forms in the early liturgies, absolutely presupposes the centrality of the sacrifice of Christ. There is no suggestion that the worshippers are *of themselves* fit to be an acceptable offering. If St. Augustine speaks of the Church as herself offered up in sacrifice, this is because she is the Body of Christ. Because He is "mediator and priest and sacrifice," therefore the union of the Church with Him means that she also is offered in sacrifice. We might say that the real presence of Christ in the sacrament is regarded as a great burning fire, and the union of Christians with Him in the act of Communion as the throwing of sticks on the fire, to be taken up into the fire and become part of it. This last analogy is particularly valuable, because it represents the real presence of Christ in the sacrament as dynamic, not static; it suggests the thought of His presence, not (as it were) in repose, but as in the active exercise of His eternal Priesthood. The real presence is the real presence of Christ's sacrifice.

This idea finds somewhat different expressions in the East and in the West. The normal Eastern type, fully developed in the great Syrian liturgies, the Clementine liturgy, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. James, contains a rehearsal of the whole story of creation and redemption, beginning after the *Sursum Corda*, taking as fixed points the *Sanctus* and the record of the Institution, and ending with a summary in the Anamnesis of the Passion, the Resurrection, and the Session in glory. Then follows the epiclesis, in which the Church prays for the descent of the Holy Spirit to hallow the gifts and the communicants. This is really a prayer for the *Gegenwärtigsetzung*,* the making present, of the mystery of redemption for which thanks has just been given in the eucharistic prayer: that the heavenly reality of Christ's sacrifice may become present, may be actualized in the sacrament under a "here" and a "now." The elements become the "antitypes" of the holy Body and Blood. This is the presupposition of the act of Communion and of the Church's self-oblation.

* Herwegen, *Kirche und Seele*, p. 16: "Das Christliche Mysterium ist dem analog die Gegenwärtigsetzung der *oikonomia*, des Heilswerkes Christi, auf das die Existenz seiner Kirche gegründet ist."

On the other hand, the Roman view attaches the consecration to the recital of the Institution, thus proclaiming that Christ, the Head of the Body, is the true celebrant of every Eucharist. This view seems to come to fully self-conscious expression first in the pseudo-Ambrosian *De sacramentis*,* but it is certainly present in Ambrose himself. But the underlying idea is nowhere, perhaps, more beautifully set forth than in the Mozarabic rite. First, we may quote a prayer which immediately preceded the words of Institution:† “Be present, be present, O Jesus, Thou good Priest, in our midst, as Thou wast in the midst of Thy disciples; sanctify this oblation, that we may receive the hallowed gifts through Thy holy angel’s hand, O holy Lord, eternal redeemer. Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the night that He was betrayed . . .” This prayer directly relates each eucharist with the Last Supper, and invokes the Lord as present, now as then, in the midst as Priest. But Lietzmann thinks that a more ancient version of the same idea is found in the prayer to Christ which occurs in some forms of this rite in the place of the epiclesis: “Be present, we pray Thee, O Lord Jesu Christ, in the midst of Thy servants, who art the founder of the feast of this banquet, and enlighten with the same blessing as then the loaves set forth on the holy table; and this cup of salvation, of wine that is to be drunk, like that which was then drunk by Thy disciples, do Thou make by Thy sanctification to be Thy blood of the new Testament.”

And, as Brilioth says, “Ambrose expresses the precise thought of the Mozarabic prayer in the words, ‘We have seen the great High Priest come to us; we have seen and heard Him offer His own blood for us; yea, He Himself is manifest among us as the offerer, since it is His holy word that hallows the sacrifice that is offered.’”‡

It may, then, truly be said that this Latin type of view reaches the same end as the Eastern epiclesis, but by a different road. In either case it is the sacrifice of Christ that is the centre of the Eucharist; and, we must note, this is not a sacrifice offered to God by men to avert His wrath or gain His favour, but the sacrifice which God Himself has made for man’s salvation. Nor, again, is there any question of a repetition of Calvary, or a reimmolation of Christ; for the thought is directed to “the heavenlies,” to the eternal character, in the one case of the Divine work of redemption, in the other of Christ as the ever-living Priest and Saviour, officiating as the Priest of His Church, as the Head of His mystical Body.

* See Stone, i. 86 f.

† These two quotations from Lietzmann, p. 105.

‡ Brilioth, p. 64. Ambrose, in *Ps. xxxviii. enar.* 25.

CONCLUSION.

Let us attempt to summarize the results which we have reached.

1. As we have just said, the centre of the eucharistic sacrifice is the one sacrifice, the sacrifice which God has made. The Eucharist is primarily and above all the embodiment or incarnation-in-liturgy of God's own sacrifice for man's redemption, and not an offering made to God by man to gain His favour. This latter idea, which has often been expressed, especially in Latin theology, in such terms as that "the priest offers to God the Body and Blood of Christ in order to gain some specified intention," involves really a very different view to that of the early liturgies. Yet Latin theology has never ceased to bear witness to the older view by the emphasis with which it has maintained the Priesthood of Christ, and that Christ is the true celebrant of every Mass.

2. At the same time the early liturgies and the patristic writings are full of references to an offering made by man in the Eucharist; and this primarily in the Offertory. Man must bring his offering to God, even though he has nothing to offer, but can only give back to God what he has received from Him, as in the "we offer to Him that which is His own" of Irenæus, the *τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν* of the Greek liturgies, and the *de tuis donis et datis* of the Latin Canon. The offered gifts are symbolical of man's willingness and readiness to offer himself.* Man brings to God his poor best, his all. If this were the whole meaning, if the eucharistic offering were merely the oblation of man's gifts, what would it amount to, in effect, but the offering to God of a few good intentions? But man brings his poor best and lays it symbolically on God's altar, lays it on Christ's sacrifice, that it may be transformed by union with Christ. As under the old Covenant the victims were transformed by the sacrificial fire, the symbol of God's acceptance,† so in the Eucharist the oblation of bread and wine is transformed by the consecration, and changed into the Body and Blood of Christ; and so, too, man's own self-oblation is taken and transformed by being united with Christ in Communion, that he may be renewed after Christ's image, and that the grace of Christ there given may remould his life into something fit for God to use. Here, then, we have the liturgical expression and embodiment of the Pauline Justification by Faith.

3. The idea of eucharistic sacrifice, which we have seen emerge, is altogether inseparable from Communion; it can in no way be limited to the consecration. It has, in fact, two foci:

* Brilioth, p. 282.

† Hicks, *The Fullness of Sacrifice*, p. 13.

the consecration unites each Mass with the one sacrifice, the sacrifice which God has made, once for all; and the Communion unites with that sacrifice the ever-renewed self-oblation of the Church.

4. It will not be amiss to mention a practical point or two in conclusion. There would be much gain in making more of the Offertory. At a church in Yorkshire known to the writer it is—or was—the custom at the people's Eucharist for the churchwardens to bring to the altar the bread and wine from the bottom of the church. Again, we hear that in some places in Belgium and North Germany the communicants themselves take and place in the ciborium the bread for their Communion. There is real positive value in this. There is real value also in the collection of the alms, which the English Prayer Books restored to us; but the effect is usually spoilt in these days by the taking of collections at other services than the Eucharist. A second point might be that we scarcely make full use of the liturgical treasure that we possess in the Prayer of Oblation; and a third, that we can never solve the problem of the Sunday service till the chief service is the congregational Eucharist with the Communion of the people. It might be added that to follow this with an *agape* in the form of a parish breakfast would serve as a symbol that the offering of sacrifice is not ended when one goes out at the church door.

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

THE FOLLOWING OF THE WAY

THE greatest joy in human experience is love. It is alone the creative principle in the sphere of art as well as life. Love is not tied or bound by hindrances of time or space. It demands further acquaintance and increasing knowledge; there is no narrow spirit in love; it burns to offer itself, and in giving it finds the fulfilment of its hope. Love is therefore truly creative and sacrificial: creative as it moves from the old to the new, joining idea to idea, friend to friend, to make a deeper truth, a more genuine bond of union; sacrificial as it denies its grosser desires or as it forgoes the less for the greater good.

Sacrifice is the great demonstration of love. The saints for the sake of their love endure hardness.. Think of St. Paul with his thorn in the flesh, of St. Francis Xavier singing praises to God with bleeding feet, of Raymon Lull facing death in the waste lands, and then remember how their love is triumphantly put to the test. The Cross, symbol of bitter shame to the Jews,

is the inspiration of Christian heroism; for the story of Calvary is the story of selfless love, obedient unto death.

Born in the narrow stable at Bethlehem, Jesus early knew pain, discomfort, and suffering. When He began to preach, His village elders thrust Him out; in Jerusalem the religious leaders condemned Him as a fanatic; while in His own familiar circle, among His disciples and friends, He had to bear with disappointment, desertion, and treachery.

Jesus asks of His disciples enthusiasm and fervour. Peter's submission to Christ is an illustration of love's conquest, for in his character there is a gradual development of all his natural qualities; they are at once both purged and enriched. John—the beloved disciple—who ran with joy through the garden on the first Easter morning, was endowed with strength of will and gentleness of heart; Simon was a zealot, a man who looked for one who might redeem Israel; Thomas the twin was perhaps a man of slow-moving mind, anxious to prove all things, yet equally determined to hold fast to that which was good.

Jesus, the supreme image of the Ancient of Days, left His stately heritage for the bare manger at Bethlehem, content to live with men as man. It is St. Luke who, with a real storyteller's talent, tells of the boyhood of Jesus. He lived for thirty years in a village of Galilee: He was a carpenter working for simple country people, making tables and mending chairs. Jesus, by His years of obedience to family discipline, as by His faithful fulfilling of a human trade, consecrated for ever the normal duties and affections of workaday life. It is sometimes forgotten to what an extent Jesus enforced His teaching with vivid illustration and incident taken from His own experience of village life and countryman's lore. Yet, in perfect harmony with this homely, natural life, there was in Jesus a constant abiding sense of the presence of God. The nights of devotion, the days of prayer were all bounded and enlarged by the spirit of His prayer in the garden, "Nevertheless, not My will, but Thine be done." Jesus gave to the followers of His Cross a shining example of perfect self-denial; it is in following Him that a vocation to heroic sanctity is disclosed. The "exceeding great promises" extended to believers are the fashioning of the body of this death into the likeness of the divine nature. Paul, writing to the Colossians, says: "When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also be manifested with Him in glory." In Jesus is the supreme showing forth of the goodness of God. In later Pauline thought He is the head of a body, the Church, which is thus utterly dependent on His direction and on His bounty. Julian of Norwich wrote from her anchorhold, "I am the ground of Thy beseeching," showing there the

truly loyal instinct of humility in which for the common good the members of the body seek no pre-eminence, but set themselves readily to obey the divine direction.

The religious leaders of Israel constantly pressed Jesus to declare Himself with the question, "By what authority doest Thou these things?" His appeal was always to His recognition of the divine will, "My father worketh and I work." This devotion of obedience gives the unifying purpose to the earthly life of Jesus, and the same singleness of heart is a Christian's glory.

All our endeavours and all our longings are worthless unless they are what Jesus would bless. In many quests of the human spirit, however, happiness may be rightly sought and found. The starry heavens in winter or a garden of flowers show forth in distinct ways the glory and beauty of God. The ever-returning parables of harvest and vintage are signs and wonders of God in cornfield and vineyard. Then, again, there are all the pleasures of the mind and the heart. The subtle interplay of thought, the arresting phrase, or the well-knit argument may clear away hindrances and prejudices that impede divine knowledge. Love should be the beginning, the measure, and the end of all Christian life. Among Christians there should be a spirit of unbounded generosity and kindly sympathy. In the intercourse of human friends God still reveals Himself, as He did once on the road to Emmaus.

All races, classes, types, and ages may appreciate the consolation of Jesus. He makes all things new; the old is nigh to vanishing away. Suffering, when known and felt as a part of the sorrowful Passion of Jesus, is a test of loyalty, almost a mark of favour. The sufferer too often forgets that his pain and distress provide opportunities of self-oblation to a God who was made perfect in weakness. Sympathy and humility are kindred virtues of the Christian life; a smile or some act of kindness may be cherished long after the sympathizer has forgotten. Joy should be no stranger to the Christian heart and face; when the disciples knew that their Friend was to be taken from them they began to be sorrowful. Yet after Pentecost, when the Spirit of Christ was come in power, then the disciples were filled with a joy and a longing which made bold to convert the world.

God come in the flesh becomes partaker of all human joys and griefs. He hallows and rejoices in our pleasures. Jesus was happy at the marriage feast at Cana, and loved the home of Bethany, where Martha, Mary, and Lazarus delighted in His friendship. Wherever Christ went on earth He had the compelling authority of goodness; wherever Christ goes today in

the hearts of His followers, whether in a back street or a drawing-room, He has still the same potent authority of love.

Jesus hated all insincerity and formalism. For Him, who after a unique fashion knew the holiness of God, there could be no lip service, nor any trifling with devotion. "Ye tithe mint and anise and cummin"; how modern is the justice of that rebuke. The doctrine of the Cross, which it may be said with reverence was first developed in the mind of Jesus and then preached to the world, is hard and uncompromising, for it asks a surrender of the will, a complete conversion of the whole personality, entire and unstinted in its love.

On the city walls of Damascus the seeker may still read the words, "Thy Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom." Such was the greatness of Jesus that even on the Cross the malefactor knew these words to be true. After the Resurrection, when Mary Magdalene with full heart tried to hold back Jesus, His vocation to carry out His Father's will still burned within Him. The Christian ought not to desire to make Christ captive while the world is still sad and imperfect. He still would go out, and with redeeming power call all men to the knowledge of His life and truth.

Prayer is at once a searching and a finding; but like love it is known and felt rather than understood, except by those who have served the apprenticeship of God. It must be considered not as an occasional excursion of the spirit, but as a state of mind and heart. William Law writes in a letter of spiritual advice:

"Reading is good, Hearing is good, Conversation and Meditation are good; but then they are only good at Times and Occasions, in a certain Degree; and must be used and governed, with such Caution, as we eat and drink, and refresh ourselves, or they will bring forth in us the fruits of Intemperance. But the Spirit of Prayer is for all Times, and all Occasions; it is a Lamp that is to be always burning, a Light to be ever-shining; every thing calls for it, every Thing is to be done in it, and governed by it; because it is, and means, and wills nothing else, but the whole Totality of the Soul, not doing this or that, but wholly incessantly given up to God, to be where and what and how he pleases."*

This special concentration in no way interferes with those chosen times and hours when the soul waits for the lovingkindness of God. There is a time for fixed prayer and a time for prayer at liberty. The mystics who have explored the depths of the spiritual life disclose the life of prayer as a progress from one stage of satisfaction to another. As intimacy with God becomes more closely cherished, so there is a recoil from all evil, whether of thought, word, or deed.

* W. Law, *Works*, vol. ix., p. 183 (Brookenhurst), 1892.

The agony in the garden of Gethsemane makes clear how bitter and sorrowful was the task which Jesus understood that He must perform. The following of Christ and the forgoing of former delights are and will be hard and bitter to frail human nature. Yet Christ will not rest content with the mere outskirts of the human personality: His love longs to command the inmost citadel of the heart. In a beautiful prayer of Bishop Cosin there is a devout aspiration which, at first a hope, may become at length a constant reality of the Christian life:

"Be Thou a light unto mine eyes, music to my ears, sweetness to my taste, and a full contentment to my heart: be Thou my sunshine in the day, my food at the table, my repose in the night, my clothing in nakedness, and my succour in all necessities."

P. HOPKINSON.

CAN SUICIDE BE JUSTIFIED?

At the end of his book, *The Problem of Right Conduct*, Canon Peter Green states, but refuses to give a complete answer to, the question whether suicide is in any circumstances permissible. He gives as example the case of a man suffering from a malignant growth which is, humanly speaking, certain to kill him in a particularly painful manner, and asks whether such a person should not be allowed, with necessary precautions, to take his own life. He confesses that he has "found it impossible to discover any really conclusive argument against suicide under due restrictions." Such an admission from Canon Green would naturally suggest extreme caution to those of much slighter experience and knowledge, but as the writer is convinced that all suicide is wrong, he has tried to think out his reasons, however imperfectly, on the lines of Canon Green's own book.

It is admitted that the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" is of general application, but it is argued that just as certain conditions make war and capital punishment legitimate, so in a case such as the one stated suicide should perhaps be allowed. The particular circumstances would seem to be (1) that he is merely anticipating certain death by it may be only a few days, (2) that he is thereby spared a good deal of horrible agony, and (3) that his relatives are spared the sorrow of watching his sufferings without being able to relieve them.

In considering whether any action is "right" or "wrong," Canon Green's first principle is that the "right" is that which is natural to man, not necessarily as he is, but as he ideally should be. The thought at once occurs that ideally man would not have such a disease and the problem would not arise; but

after all we have to deal with man as he is, and to apply to his present conditions as far as may be the standards of ideal manhood, and we therefore ask ourselves whether ideally man would desire to escape some personal suffering by breaking what is admittedly one of the commandments of God. The only standard by which we can judge is the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, and His Manhood is surely an instance of the application of ideal standards to the imperfect conditions of this world. His actions on the Cross when an extremely painful death was certain would at least seem to suggest *prima facie* that the ideal is the cultivation of the virtues of courage and endurance.*

May we go further and say that not only is the bearing of such pain the ideal, but also that its avoidance by self-destruction is definitely wrong and never to be allowed? In applying his first general principle to particular cases, Canon Green considers man as (a) an individual, and his actions with reference (i.) to God and (ii.) to self; (b) as a social being, and his actions with reference to his fellows; (c) as a spiritual being.

(a) *Individual*.—(i.) Is this particular action a sin against God? This, for a Christian, is obviously the most important category, and anything which could be definitely so pronounced would be *ipso facto* condemned. Canon Green considers the argument that "as God alone confers life, God alone may decree its end" to be "impossible while we permit war and capital punishment," yet it seems to the present writer that this is the attitude we must adopt in condemning suicide—namely, that all taking of man's life is an offence against God, and is *per se* wrong; that it can never be really even a matter of indifference.

Yet this is not necessarily to imply that war and capital punishment are in all circumstances to be avoided at any cost. Canon Green himself suggests a principle that it may conceivably happen that no right course of action is possible; that the presence or effect of sin may involve a choice between two courses, both of which are wrong; and surely this is the case with war and capital punishment. Both involve a wrong action—namely, the taking of life—in order to prevent a worse, which is the only alternative. Until all other possible courses have been tried, both should be avoided. Is it possible, then, that in the case propounded the alternative course—*i.e.*, living in pain—is morally worse than self-killing?

Both capital punishment and war partake of the nature of punishment, and are justified on four grounds:

1. That they are vindictive, upholding the force and majesty

* This seems to have no real bearing on the use of anæsthetics, for they do not involve the termination of life unless through an accident.

of law—a reason which would appear to be inapplicable to the instance we have under consideration, since the majesty of law is not called in question.

2. That they are reformatory, giving occasion for repentance to the sufferer. But he suffers at the hand of another; and can a man be said to be inflicting reformatory punishment upon himself when he takes his own life, knowingly depriving God of His prerogative, chiefly to escape suffering? Repentance seems the very opposite of such an attitude.

3. That they are preventive—*i.e.*, that a man may kill in order to save the lives of himself and others which would otherwise be endangered; but there is here no suggestion of danger to any life but his own, which he is soon to lose in any event, and is certainly not preserved by suicide.

4. That they are deterrent, discouraging others from copying the crime which has deserved punishment. It is impossible to argue that permission for suicide will deter others from contracting the disease; it is more likely to make them fear it less, and also have a lower idea of the value of human life.

If self-destruction is, then, an offence against God, and the circumstances which may be alleged in partial extenuation of war and capital punishment do not apply, it would seem unnecessary to proceed any further, yet the argument may be supported by brief reference to the other categories.

(ii.) It seems certainly to be a sin against self. In the first place it is arguable that it makes true repentance entirely impossible (see 2 above), for it assumes that a personal, temporal, physical benefit is to be preferred to obedience to the law of God. Further, it is to deprive oneself of the opportunity of exhibiting and cultivating such virtues as were shown by our Saviour in His sacred Passion, and which may be necessary for the perfection of one's character.

(b) *Social*.—From the social aspect it is urged in extenuation of war and capital punishment that the bond of the society has been broken; that the criminal by his murder and the enemy by his aggression have placed themselves outside the covenant, and have therefore no longer any rights as against the community. Here, too, it will be seen that there is no parallel to the man who has contracted a malignant disease. On the contrary, it is possible from the point of view of the community to argue quite definitely against his being allowed to end his life. First, the almost inevitable result of such permission would be the lowering of ideals, both as regards the sanctity of human life and the courageous bearing of suffering. Then there would undoubtedly be grave danger of insistent demands for the extension of the privilege, as, *e.g.*, in the case of divorce.

It must be admitted that this in itself is not sufficient reason for refusing the permission, if it were otherwise desirable, yet it must be taken into account, especially when we find serious reasons against it on other more definite grounds.

There is still left for consideration the argument that the motive is after all not merely a selfish desire to avoid pain, but also a wish to spare the sufferings of those who are called upon to minister to the patient. Can this fact override the objections which have so far been urged against legalized suicide?

It would not be easy to maintain that the comparatively short period of mental anguish on the part of the sufferer's friends and relatives should outweigh the spiritual danger of suicide both to the patient and to the community in general. It is possible, on the other hand, to see that his self-destruction would deprive them both of opportunities of service, which would undoubtedly be capable of ennobling their characters, and also of the encouragement to be derived from contact with an example of patiently and nobly borne suffering.

(c) *Spiritual*.—So far we have entirely omitted any consideration of the mystical power of suffering. But if in addition to all that has been urged we dwell upon the mere possibility of its redemptive power when joined to that of our Saviour, and with Him offered as an act of expiation; if we regard it as in some measure a sharing of His Cross and Passion, a filling up in ourselves of what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ, the arguments against the granting of any permission, however guarded, to take one's own life would seem far to outweigh what are by comparison the very slight benefits which could be alleged to result if such a course of action were allowed.

H. R. WILSON.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE Editor will be moving house during the last fortnight of August, and will be glad to be spared correspondence as far as possible from the 15th to the end of the month.

We are obliged to the Hon. Librarian of the Catholic Truth Society for pointing out to us that the title of the Pope's recent Encyclical is *Quadragesimo Anno*, and not, as we erroneously gave it last month, *Quadragesima Annis*. The Encyclical is published in English by the C.T.S. under the title *The Social Order : Its Reconstruction and Perfection* (price 2d.).

The Rev. E. L. Lewis writes with regard to Professor Fridrichsen's article in the March issue of *THEOLOGY* as follows:

The article by Professor A. Fridrichsen on the conflict of Jesus with the unclean spirits is hard to understand in one respect. "Jesus does not consider the demons as more or less free and independent beings, but as the servants of Satan." I assume that he thinks the Pharisees were ignorant and had wrong ideas about demons. He also thinks the accusation has been altered to make "its absurdity immediately evident." But surely the accusation was exactly what they had in mind. They said Jesus was a bad man and that Beelzebul worked through Him to win the people to believe in Him. Our Lord's answer is according to that accusation. He is not giving any new teaching. He simply told them what they knew quite well, and brought the lie home to them. They lied behind His back, and He told them face to face what they knew. If their sons or exorcists were under God's control, they knew He was. They knew it was Beelzebul's evil work and that he did not undo his own work. Satan does not cast out Satan. The fact that they could not always cast them out made them look forward to the coming of the Kingdom in which the Messiah never failed. Jesus never failed, not even in the case of a blind man, and so they knew the Kingdom had come. If they really believed Jesus was a bad man whom Beelzebul used to attract the people, there is no point in our Lord's answer. They could still say He was an impostor and Beelzebul's servant. They knew better. They knew it was by the Spirit of God that He cast them out and not by Beelzebul. The charge had nothing to do with magic. If the accusation is not rightly recorded, then our Lord's answer is not.

Since they knew the three foregoing points in regard to the power that cast out demons, there was no need for any other answer. For instance, Jesus could have introduced other miracles. He could have said: "You know quite well that I can perform good miracles which have nothing to do with Beelzebul, and that God would not work through one under Beelzebul's control." Some think that the Pharisees really were ignorant, that they believed the man sold his soul in exchange for a cure. Be cured and then damned. But they do not realize one simple point. There would then be no point in our Lord's answer, for they could have answered Him: "It is true that Beelzebul is undoing the work he loves through you, but he uses you for a nefarious purpose—to damn the man's soul for ever."

If the Pharisees were ignorant, Christ would not have spoken so seriously

to them. They were calling good bad when they knew it was good, and that endangered the salvation of their souls. Beelzebul did not raise Lazarus, and their lies were exposed. The Son of God was glorified, and so they summoned a council meeting to put Him to death. They had reason to think He would lay aside His miraculous power to die, and they were going to test it. I believe that they lied against His miracles, because they gave authority to His words. The truth seems to be that Christ was put to death because of His miracles. Miracles can neither be separated from His death nor from the reason why He died. He died for sin, and sin is not ignorance.

LITURGICA

WHAT ought to be done in our churches on Holy Saturday, or "Easter Even," as our Prayer Book prefers to call it? At present there is much confusion, and guidance would be welcomed by many. No observance has established itself in the way that the Three Hours' Devotion has come to be associated with Good Friday; so the way is still open to build up a good tradition. It should be borne in mind that Holy Saturday is one of the great fast-days of the year; it was known in early centuries as the "Grand Fast," and accordingly it should not be neglected, as too often is the case, and regarded as a day when the church can be given up to the decorators preparing for the coming feast. The Vigil of Easter demands some observance from faithful Christians, but its curiously mixed character has led to great variety in the liturgical arrangements. Three differing methods are found amongst us—viz.: (1) To treat the day as a mere blank, utilizing the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel from the Prayer Book for "Ante-Communion," and concluding the day with a somewhat anomalous "First Evensong of Easter." (2) To follow the Latin Rite and perform the ceremonies of the Blessing of the New Fire, etc., in the morning, leading up to the "first Mass of Easter." As Vespers is simply an attenuated form of that office added on at the close of the Mass, there is no Evensong said on that day. (3) To frame an appropriate form of service for this day, following in the main liturgical models, but retaining freedom to discard elements which seem no longer valuable. Thus in some churches the New Fire, the Paschal Light, and Solemn Baptism take place in the evening of Holy Saturday, but the first Mass of Easter is not said till Easter Day, and the reading of the "Prophecies" is omitted. Other churches use a form compiled many years ago by the Rev. G. Baden-Powell, an adaptation of the ancient litany sung in procession to the Font. The Community of the Resurrection has a form of evening office which includes some of the Prophecies followed by Tracts.

The whole matter needs to be taken in hand by liturgical scholars in consultation with practical parish priests. Obviously, the determining consideration is the position of the first Mass of Easter. If it is agreed that this should be sung on the Saturday, then all the ceremonies will naturally precede it. It is unintelligent to defer them till the evening. The earliest attempt to provide for this day was governed by the desire to make the first Alleluia coincide with the supposed moment of the Resurrection. Consequently the first Mass of Easter was at midnight, and the ceremonies preceded it on the Saturday evening. The ceremonies were pushed back, in the eighth century, to the afternoon. It is supposed that this change was due to abuses connected with the assembling

of enormous numbers of catechumens in the darkened churches on the vigil preparatory to Baptism. In course of time the observances were still further anticipated, so that now they take place in the morning. This leads to the inappropriateness of references to "this night" in offices said in broad daylight. Fr. Thurston, in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, comments on the unsatisfactory character of this plan, and there seems no compelling reason for Anglicans to follow it. The Bishop of Truro considers that the Reformers deliberately innovated in providing the "proper" in the Prayer Book, which is clearly not that of an Easter Eucharist, but partakes of a penitential character. Apart from this, the difficulty of securing servers and singers on a Saturday morning, and the inordinate length of the service, render the Latin method impossible on grounds of practical convenience, unless the plan adopted in parts of France were followed, by which several churches combine to perform the ceremonies.

If, however, we keep the Easter Mass till Easter Day, we have in Easter Even an "a-liturgical day" with an appropriate Collect, Epistle, and Gospel provided in the Prayer Book, and a simple—certainly not "festal"—Evensong. This reverts to the principle which prevailed in early Christian centuries, but it leaves us without those dramatic observances of the Great Watch which can be traced back to the time of Constantine. These comprise the Blessing of the New Fire, the lighting of the Paschal Candle and all the lamps in church, the reading of the Prophecies, the chanting of the Litany of the Saints, the Blessing of the Font, and the Solemn Administration of Baptism. Which, if any, of these ceremonies should be retained? It is undesirable, on a night when many confessions will probably be heard, to overload the evening with many lengthy ceremonies. Solemn Baptism should be retained if possible, as Easter Eve is the traditional time for the administration of that Sacrament. Some form of litany in procession to the font is appropriate and does not protract the service unduly. The employment of the other ceremonies, and their order, are questions for experts. We should venture a plea for the Blessing of the Font, though this, perhaps, is already provided for in the prayer in our existing office: "Almighty and Everliving God whose most dearly-beloved Son," etc. That it was traditionally regarded as a form for the hallowing of water is shown by the desire on the part of the worshippers to take away with them the "Baptism water" from the font (*Vaux, Church Folklore*).

There is little to be said for the reading of the long series of twelve Prophecies. At Durham these were reduced to five, a plan which has been followed in the *Mirfield Holy Week Book*, but what is suitable for a religious community may be incongruous in a parish church.

The Blessing of the New Fire and the lighting of the Paschal Candle are very ancient, and possibly have a pre-Christian origin. They form not the least impressive of the Holy Saturday customs, and where the singing of the "Exsultet" is possible, it may surely find a place. It is the solemn prayer, passing into a "preface" of eucharistic form, sung by the Deacon at the Blessing of the Candle, and is one of the most beautiful and intricate pieces of plain-song known to us. But it takes twenty minutes to sing, and demands a skilled singer, so it is doubtful whether this should be included when drawing up forms of devotion for parish churches.

The need of something more than the penitential Prayer Book services is widely felt, and has resulted in the rather inappropriate festal Evensong

which often precedes Easter in our churches. This has no liturgical precedent, so it is hoped that a revival of the ancient and symbolic usages of Easter Even, so far as they lend themselves to the devotional needs of congregations, may take its place. "Such decent solemnities" as Wheatly called them in 1722, "should not be looked upon as popish and anti-Christian."

MARCUS DONOVAN.

THE FIFTH ANGLO-RUSSIAN STUDENT CONFERENCE

THE fifth of the annual conferences of English and Russian students, arranged by the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius under the auspices of the S.C.M., was held at High Leigh, Hertfordshire, from Thursday, April 16, to Tuesday, April 21, the subject chosen being the important and topical one of "The Church." As in previous years the sharing of a common worship was the foundation on which all the activities of the gathering were built; every day began with an English or Russian Mass and ended with Evensong or Vespers.

As compared with earlier conferences there was a much smaller senior and official element, though this fully made up in quality what it lacked in quantity. It is one of the striking facts about these conferences that each one seems to have its own atmosphere, its own function in the building up of the life of the Fellowship, and its own specific contribution to the cause of Reunion. This year there was nothing like the historic meeting of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Metropolitan Eulogius, which made such a deep impression on all the delegates to the fourth conference; there was rather a sense of deep and unemotional personal intimacy and of quiet confidence in the future of the movement, which made the consideration of the very practical question that the conference had set itself to study extraordinarily fruitful. And here it is perhaps not out of place to remark that the papers read reached perhaps a higher standard of excellence than ever before; it was not merely that they were quite outstanding from the point of view of theological exposition—that was to be expected—but that, from the point of view of the very mixed and, as regards many members, inexperienced audience, they were wonderfully arresting, intelligible, and inspiring.

At three formal sessions the subject was considered under three main aspects: "One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church" (Archpriest S. Bulgakoff and Canon C. Crum), "Authority and Freedom" (Professor Florovsky and Canon H. L. Goudge), and "Church and State" (Professor Kartashoff and Dr. K. E. Kirk), with a supplementary paper on "Lambeth and Anglo-Orthodox Reunion," by Canon J. A. Douglas. The papers were in each case followed by group-discussion, in which points of agreement and difference were discussed and which gave the younger members very valuable opportunities of improving their understanding of the points at issue by conversation with the authors of the papers. There were also informal addresses on such matters as the work now being carried on in Paris among the Russian youth and on the state of the Church in Russia; and this report would be quite incomplete without a reference to the social side of the conference, which did so much to promote that absence of restraint which is so necessary to a frank

facing of the facts of our divided church life. We were not the accredited representatives of our Churches meeting to discuss terms of reunion; we were simply very humble followers of our Lord trying to understand one another and to share with one another what we have received from Him. And for this a thorough personal intimacy is necessary, and it is by this that the interspersion, within a crowded programme, of some quite informal and not very serious amusement is to be justified as not merely harmless in itself but of the greatest value in furthering the aim for which the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius exists.

In retrospect, the steady advance made in the Anglo-Russian Conferences is most marked. At the second conference, in 1928, at St. Albans, very similar subjects were discussed, and it is amazing, to one who was present on that and on the present occasion, to see how differences that appeared almost irreconcilable have completely evaporated in the atmosphere of common worship and study; much still remains to be done, but it is perhaps not presumptuous to feel that, side by side with the official deliberations and negotiations of the hierarchs of the two Churches, the Fellowship is doing a work which only it can perform—the realization in the inner lives of a few individual Christians of the unity which, as an external fact, is still in the future. When reunion comes as the outcome of negotiations by theologians and bishops, the members of the Churches themselves must be ready to welcome and accept it; how valuable then may it not be for there to exist even a small number of Anglicans and Orthodox who await it, not as a mere fact of ecclesiastical diplomacy, but as the manifestation as an historical fact of a unity that they have experienced as a spiritual reality.

One further point: one hears at the present time many appeals that intercommunion should be allowed when Christians of different denomination who are seriously working for unity find themselves in conference together. I would only say this—that as regards the Anglo-Russian Conferences it is clear to all concerned that such an action would not be a step towards complete reunion; it would be simply disastrous. Much as we long for it, intercommunion now would be merely an attempt to gather the fruits of our sowing before we have tended the plant to full growth; it would blind us to the magnitude of the task we have still to perform; it would be a spiritual luxury to which we have as yet no right. Such conferences as these make it clear that intercommunion is not the first, but the final step in the work of reunion; we must wipe out our sins and those of our fathers before we enter into the fulness of the reunited Church.

E. L. MASCALL.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques.

M. Sertillanges contributes an interesting article to the October (1930) number of this review, entitled "Saint Thomas d'Aquin, homme du temps présent." The present century has witnessed an astonishing revival of interest in St. Thomas as the most powerful and influential representative of the mediæval intelligence. Is that revival to have the same character and therefore the same fate as the early nineteenth-century revival of interest in mediæval art? Is it to be, like neo-Gothic architecture, a feeble, and

in the end contemptible, imitation of the past, or can it be a fruitful source of present and future philosophical speculation?

M. Sertillanges contends that the cases are not really parallel, and that therefore the fate which attended what is known as the Gothic revival need have no terrors for those who believe in the renewal of a Thomist type of philosophy. Art is an individual reaction to the real as beautiful. Philosophy is a seizure of the real itself, of objective truth, or it is nothing. That at least is its enduring pith and substance. It has also of course, like art, its subjective side, variations of attitude in the search for truth due to the intellectual temperament of individual thinkers or the dominant intellectual interests of particular epochs. So far as the Thomistic philosophy was thus conditioned it is, like every other philosophy, subject to revision, and the measure of such revision which its genuine renewal may concede and even require may prove to be quite considerable. But what distinguishes it from the modern critical philosophies is its enduring substance. "It penetrated beneath the roots of time and recovered the eternal substance of things." It trusted the intellect as an instrument of truth. It interpreted the universe with the aid of ideas extracted by the intellect from things themselves. In short, St. Thomas had learned from Aristotle that the task of philosophy was to establish the intelligibility of the real, a task which was possible of accomplishment only in so far as it cherished the faith that the real was intelligible. That, according to M. Sertillanges, is the highroad of philosophy to which we moderns, who have abandoned it to wander down innumerable side-tracks, need to return. He is himself the sanest of Thomists and has no illusions as to the extent of the changes of detail in Thomist doctrine which may be necessary owing to the supersession of thirteenth-century cosmological and physical knowledge. But he is all the more convinced that the main lines of the Thomist metaphysic represent the framework of intellectual order within which alone philosophy can now fruitfully advance, and that such advance depends on a fresh *maîtrise* of Thomas's thought. The only authentic fashion of being Thomist will consist in so entering into the spirit of the Master's doctrine that ever more ambitious acquisitions of the true may through it become possible. M. Sertillanges admits that there are as yet few signs in Neo-Thomism of any considerable achievement of the required mastery.

In a recent number of this review the Dominican Father Bliguet made a careful examination of the antecedents of the Vatican definition of the nature of the Church in 1870. This study had a certain originality and completeness in that it was founded upon a review not only of the discussions in the Council itself which preceded the adoption of the formula finally agreed upon, but also of the preparatory work of the theologians charged with drawing up a formula for submission to the Council and of the members of the Deputation of the Faith. At each of these three stages Father Bliguet signalized the influence of what he calls "the apologetic of tradition" in the person of Cardinal Dechamps, Archbishop of Malines. All students of the history of the Council are of course aware of the immense authority exercised by the Cardinal in the deliberations of that assembly. But not all perhaps had considered sufficiently how much that authority represented a triumph for the "traditional apologetic" associated with the names of Joseph de Maistre, Bonald, Lamennais, and Lacordaire. M. Bliguet's article was devoted mainly to proving the dependence of Dechamps upon Lacordaire. To the October number the

Redemptorist Father Kremer contributes an important supplementary study of Dechamps' apologetic and its sources, for which he has been able to use the Cardinal's own manuscript notes for his speeches as a member of the Deputation of the Faith now preserved in the archives of the Archbishopric of Malines. Father Kremer is not willing to concede an immediate dependence of the theologian of his own order upon Lacordaire, but maintains rather their common use, in complete independence of each other, of the traditionalist current of ideas due to the genius of Joseph de Maistre and Lamennais. His brief but sufficient and most interesting study of Dechamps' theological formation seems certainly to prove his case. But his article is additionally important for the light it throws upon the true inwardness of the Vatican definitions of Infallibility and of the Church and of their close mutual relatedness. He begins by saying, "A dominating fact in the history of apologetic and theology in their latest developments is the ever more and more important rôle attributed in them to the Church," and adds that though systematization in the matter is far as yet from being complete, yet it seems that its dominant tendency is "to reach a better understanding of the place occupied by the Church, as continuing the action of Christ and prolonging His personality, in the work of salvation and in the acquisition of faith." That this systematization is at any rate making good progress will be apparent, I think, to the reader of the section of Père Sertillanges' *Catéchisme des Incroyants* devoted to the Church. This brilliant *tour de force* of apologetic leaves little doubt both that the chief motive of credibility today is the existence of the Church, and that its value as such a motive has been not only enhanced but for the first time brought clearly into prominence by the proclamation of Infallibility. "The definitive installation of the Papacy in its historic rôle," says M. Sertillanges, "is a fact parallel to the definitive installation of the true religion upon this earth." And when his ingenuous *incroyant* poses the question which he evidently means to be politely disconcerting, "This new fact then constitutes for you a real point of departure?" M. Sertillanges triumphantly answers: "It is a point of departure because it is the Christ fully manifested and recognized in His temporal representation. That is why I reply to those who pretend that the Church is dying: 'The Church is beginning.'" We have not realized perhaps how large an influence upon recent developments of theology among ourselves is to be traced to definitions which we profess to regard as a new stone of stumbling and rock of offence.

One of the most interesting features of this review is its philosophical and theological bulletins. This number contains four bulletins—Philosophy, History of Philosophy, Christian Archæology, and Theology. The philosophical bulletin is confined to Père Deman's review of recent works in moral philosophy. English readers will be specially interested in the very full, sympathetic, and discriminating notices of Professor Laird's *The Idea of Value* and Dr. Broad's *Five Types of Ethical Theory*. The bulletin of the History of Philosophy is divided into two parts—Greek and Modern—dealt with by Père Simonin and XXX respectively. The forty pages devoted to this section are not only very full in that nothing of any importance recently written has been omitted, but also admirably arranged. All the works which deal with each philosopher are treated under his name. Thus the eye easily catches the headings: *Platon, Aristote, Plotin*, etc., or *Descartes, Spinoza, Hobbes*, etc., in large

type. No student of philosophy can more easily or with more trustworthy guidance find his way through the maze of contemporary philosophical writings than by following regularly the bulletins of this review.

The same may be said of its theological bulletins. The generosity of its editors, which is nothing more (or nothing less) than their purpose to consider seriously everything that is seriously and competently written, may be estimated by the fact that in a recent number ninety pages were devoted to reviews, by three most competent scholars, of recent non-Catholic theology—Orthodox, theology in the English language, and German Protestant—in roughly equal portions. In the present number the theological bulletin has two sections, speculative and spiritual theology. Readers of Dr. Kirk's recently-published Bampton Lectures will perhaps like to consult the notice by Père Hérís of two books whose conclusions as to the existence in man of an innate desire of the vision of God are strongly contrasted, Professor O'Mahony's *The Desire of God in the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* and M. Van der Meersch's *De Notione Entis Supernaturalis*.

A. L. L.

Analecta Bollandiana.

More than half the current number, 124 pages out of 240, is taken up with the *Bulletin des Publications Hagiographiques*, which as usual contains full and valuable notes on recent publications, even if only remotely connected with Hagiology. At least *A History of Church Discipline in Scotland*, about which the reviewer writes, "Par Church Discipline, les Presbytériens écossais entendent la façon dont l'église traite les pêcheurs," has only an indirect connexion with the study of the saints. There are two important articles on Martyrologies, which will appeal, however, to a limited public. One consists of notes on *Certain Dates in the Martyrology of St. Jerome*, by Père Delehaye, S.J., in which he makes certain corrections in the names commemorated on those days, an interim contribution, until "he can give the reader a complete commentary on a document so important but so strangely disfigured in the course of ages." We hope we shall not have to wait long for the publication of this commentary.

There is also published for the first time a "Martyrology of the Church of St. Peter at Rome to which are added those selections from the martyrology of Bede which used to be read for the profit of the people of Rome, abundantly interspersed with extracts from the works of Jerome." This Codex was used by Henschan and Papebruck, but has not previously been printed in full. Its interest, therefore, is considerable.

Among the not least interesting, if comparatively unimportant, features, are the medical and astrological directions prefixed to the calendar for each month. Certain days are given as unsuitable for bleeding. Radishes could be eaten in March but not in April. Beer was not to be drunk in June. Baths were not to be taken in November or December. In May heads—the sort of head not specified—were not to be eaten. In September, on the other hand, there were no restrictions. In January those who are fasting are recommended to drink a potion of ginger or rhubarb.

C. P. S. C.

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1931. Heft 1/2.

This severely technical double number is largely devoted to Isaiah, no fewer than four articles on this book, amounting to 84 pages, being included. There are also papers on Moses' Song at the Red Sea and on Phœnician Religion; and critical notes on Job. The paper of most general interest is J. Morgenstein's on Matriarchal Marriage Customs. He explains Genesis xxxiv. as a clash between Canaanite and Hebrew conceptions of marriage. Dinah went out to watch the Canaanite maidens (at their vineyard dance, where they expected to be captured in marriage). Shechem took her in accordance with native custom. To her brothers this was intolerable. If their one sister left home, the clan would die out, for as they married they would found families which would be reckoned as belonging to their wives' clans.

A review mentions the very interesting point established lately by H. Schaeder. Ezra is called, in Ezra vii. 71, "Ezra the priest, the Sāphār of the law of the God of heaven"—i.e., the Secretary, or high official, charged with the affairs of Yahweh's religion, according to the old Babylonian and Canaanite use of the word. Thus *Sāpir Nari* in Accadian is the head of the canal administration. But in the writings of the Chronicler *Shōhār* was vocalized as *Sōphēr*, or scribe, and so the Persian official became the prototype of the Jewish scribes.

W. K. L. C.

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1931. Heft 1.

E SCHWARTZ discusses the Greek text of the Canons of Sardica, with special reference to C. H. Turner's work on them. G. KITTEL returns to the subject of E. Sievers' "schallanalytisch" work on the N.T., the baselessness of which Lietzmann is supposed to have demonstrated. By analyzing the sounds Sievers thinks we can establish criteria with which to judge problems of authorship. It is surprising to learn that of his great book on the Pauline Epistles, fewer than forty copies have been sold; somehow we English always conclude that there is a market in Germany for a solid German work which we find unreadable. Sievers' conclusions are remarkable. There are many voices in the Pauline Epistles, which can often be associated with the names of the persons that occur in the relevant passages. There are four voices in St. Mark. The characteristic voice of the Johannine tradition is found in all three Synoptists. In the Epistle of James an unbroken unity appears. Kittel pleads for more study of Sievers' position. The method is most useful when the writing is most studied and nearest to poetry. The delicate touches on which we rely may be ruined by a redactor or a scribe. But enough remains to deserve serious consideration. R. P. CASEY studies the textual families of Athanasian MSS. W. MICHAELIS writes an acute article on "Judaistic Gentile-Christians." There were three stages of propaganda: (i.) The winning of Jews and proselytes to become Christians as well as Jews; (ii.) the mission to Gentiles who were led to become Christians *and Jews*, Christians through the door of circumcision; (iii.) the winning of Gentiles to become Christians without becoming Jews. The second stage is attested by Acts xi. 20. The Church of Antioch was largely composed of such converts, and Gal. ii. must be read in the light of this

conclusion. Paul and Barnabas will have adopted the third method on their first missionary journey.

K. G. GOETZ discusses the "censor" of the "Zadokite work," and rejects the theory that he was the prototype of the Christian bishop; for in the Talmud the word *mēbaqqēr* (which Charles translates "censor") does not occur, the earliest *episcopoi* were not monarchical, and the functions of the "censor" are hardly those of the primitive bishop, though they do recur in the description given by the Syriac Didascalia. His arguments hardly affect the statement of the matter in THEOLOGY of December, 1930, which was expressed in a sufficiently guarded way.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

The Journal of Religion. Vol. xi., No. 2.

An important and weighty review of contemporary German Christology by Dr. Dibelius is the outstanding contribution to this number. It is followed by a trenchant criticism of Freudian Psychology, in which J. E. Turner of Liverpool University contends that Freud's argument, when carried to its conclusion, collapses through self-contradiction. "Case Work in the Cure of Souls," by Charles T. Holman, resolves itself into a plea for the principles of the Charity Organization Society expressed in terms of psychiatry, psychology, sociology, and mental hygiene. The conclusion reached, after a scornful rejection of a crude travesty to which the term "theological explanation" is quite erroneously given, is that "a careful study of the technique of the social case-worker will help the pastor to develop an adequate technique for his own purposes." Dr. Shailer Matthews on "Social Patterns and the Idea of God" leaves us utterly bewildered. It would seem that "if one undertakes to study the history of any idea of God as it has been expressed in social patterns, one must study it as a phase of a single social process. We must pass from the consideration of religion to specific religions, each a technique in which religion as a vital urge expresses itself." Christianity "must be viewed as a genetic social and religious movement rather than a system of truth."

H. S. M.

The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought. Vol. viii., No. 2.

This number is devoted to the subject of "Humanism": how it came, its predicament, its significance, itself. John Baillie, discussing the predicament of Humanism, says his own feeling is that "the typical humanist is as little able to hold himself up by his own boot-straps as are the rest of us. When I talk with him or when I read his books, I very often find that he is secretly supporting himself by means of some article of belief that, to my mind, takes more believing—or rather requires more credulity—than does anything in the Christian gospel." A very acute observation.

H. S. M.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

In the opening article of the April number Father Faux writes ably on the Orphism of St. Paul. It is the first of what is plainly meant

to be a series and a valuable series. The writer investigates the strange mixture of the religions of the East and West that forms the background of the thought of the Apostle to the Gentiles. There is a particularly good section on the two sources that altered the course of Orphic thought. Father Gougaud, who is a high authority on all that concerns Celtic civilization, examines the labours of the monastic scribes of Ireland. He has much to say on the technique of the illumination these scribes employed, and no one who has ever seen "The Book of Kells" can doubt to what a high pitch of perfection they brought this art of illumination. Father Gougaud, however, deals with it rather from the point of view of seeing what influences were brought to bear on this illumination. Father De Bruyne prints a document on the Adoptionist controversy in Spain, and he dates it about 800 A.D. Father Halkin writes shortly on the charges preferred against Cardinal de Lapalud, and his document adds to our knowledge of the fifteenth century. Father Dagens examines the thought of Cardinal de Bérulle, and much of his article is taken up with an analysis of the Cardinal's "Brief discours de l'abnégation intérieure," and students of mysticism cannot afford to neglect this article. There is also an account of the Cardinal's correspondence.

R. H. M.

Theologische Blätter. June.

This number of the *Theologische Blätter* contains the papers read at the Anglo-German theological conference held at Chichester, March 23-28. A preface gives the names of those who took part in the conference and other details connected with it, and the last paper is followed by a summary drawn up by Professor K. L. Schmidt with the assistance of Rev. Sir E. C. Hoskyns and Lic. H. Sasse. We may also note a review by O. Bauhofer, one of the members of the conference, of *Dogma in History and Thought*, edited by Dr. W. R. Matthews.

L. P.

REVIEWS

EVANGELICAL CATHOLICISM TODAY

THIS journal was, I believe, the second in England to call attention to Friedrich Heiler's remarkable theological work, in an article called "Evangelical Catholicism" (February, 1924); it had been anticipated by Dr. Inge. Heiler was then a recent convert to Lutheranism from the Roman Catholic Church. His great book on Catholicism showed unrivalled skill in diagnosis and description, and unusual sympathy with the institutions he had deserted; incidentally it gave a first sketch of an alternative ideal to that of Western Catholicism. His latest book, the second volume of collected essays, *Im Ringen um die Kirche*,* marks an advance even on the high level of the previous book. Its warm Christian spirit, beautiful literary style, ecumenical sympathies and knowledge, combine to make it remarkable. The Evangelical Catholicism of the earlier book has now become a living force, thanks largely to his powerful influence.

Englishmen are naturally attracted by his sympathy with their religious movements. It is good to read that von Hügel "was the greatest spirit of which the Catholic Church can boast since Cardinal Newman" both of them Englishmen. A visit to Littlemore Church was the most thrilling of all Heiler's experiences in England. His judgments of Anglicanism are so generous and sympathetic that we are prepared to take his criticisms in good part. The Lambeth Appeal of 1920 is definitely a failure. Nobody wants our Anglican minimizing, with its insistence on Episcopal ordination as the bond of union. Neither genuine Catholicism nor prophetic Protestantism can come to terms with it. "This explains the instinctive repugnance, often going so far as irritation, of all genuine Protestants against Anglicanism, which in its stiff insistence on a minimal institutionalism seems to them more intolerable than the maximal and universal institutionalism of the Orthodox and Roman Church" (p. 308). The Anglican Church is not fully Catholic, though it is on its way to become so. There is something lacking in its Orders, for lack of proper intention at one period. The real *apologia* for Anglican Orders is found in the wonderful sacramental life of Anglicanism, not in the arguments regarding Apostolic Succession, to which its scholars have contributed most of all. Two other judgments. The 1928 Prayer Book "is a masterpiece of compromise, which must be

* Ernst Reinhardt, München. M. 12 paper; M. 14 linen boards.

judged more from the standpoint of ecclesiastical politics than liturgically" (p. 424). And it is an irony that the extreme Anglo-Catholics are propagating post-Tridentine ideals at a time when the best minds of the Roman Communion are going back to the Middle Ages and behind them to the primitive Church.

This is familiar enough to our readers. Heiler's judgments on Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are more novel. The German Liberals at Lausanne said ruefully: "We have swallowed the Nicene Creed." It would have been impossible fifteen years earlier. The Jesus-religion and Jesus-theology of Protestant Liberalism has completely disappeared. "That wonderful flower lies today withered by the roadside, or dried in a Church History herbarium" (p. 53). Four causes contributed to its overthrow: (i.) the eschatological interpretation of the Gospel of Jesus; (ii.) the attack of Drews and the mythological school, which, failing in its immediate object, succeeded in showing the unhistorical nature of the Liberal picture of Jesus; (iii.) the advance in New Testament criticism, which proved that the Jesus of the Gospels is largely the product of the Christ-cult of the Church;* (iv.) Barth's "dialectic" theology. It failed because it was literally, as Pius X. said, a *heresy*, that is a *selection* from the whole Christ.

Heiler has no quarter for the dialectic theology. It is a revival of Marcionitism, the gospel of "the strange god," in that it separates Christ and the souls of Christians. It is no renewal of the Reformers' faith, but the extreme example of the desire to banish all that is left of the Church in Protestantism. Behind its imposing talk of "Word" and "Revelation" is often hidden an icy scepticism. Heiler even quotes without disapproval a Roman Catholic judgment that it is "the theological form of atheism" (p. 449).

Yet Lutheranism has within it the capacity for renewal. In the classical period it has the *Confessio Augustana*, with its clear recognition of the two poles of the ellipse—Catholic and Protestant, as Anglicanism has its seventeenth century. Lutheranism has in its *Agenden* richer liturgical material than Anglicanism possesses. It has never lost Confession, and, unlike Anglicanism, it escaped an Iconoclastic period.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the sketch of contemporary Roman Catholic tendencies. On the one hand there are the continual growth in the centralizing and legalizing process, the spying and delation, the silencing of the monks of Union, the Encyclical "Mortalium animos" (not, however, to

* This would be accepted by English theologians only with considerable qualifications.

be taken too tragically—this is the traditional language of the Curia), the preparations for a definition of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin as *de fide*, and the ever-increasing height of the fence between Roman Catholics and other Christians. But all this gives only one side of the picture. We must not judge Romanism by what we hear and read. The severity of the censorship must be remembered; utterances opposed to the prevailing tendency are not allowed to be heard. The other side appears chiefly in German Catholicism, which appears half Protestant in the eyes of Latin Catholics. The liturgical movement, the new emphasis on Bible reading, and the message of Evangelical freedom and joy given by Joseph Wittig and received so enthusiastically, tell a very different tale. Wittig's excommunication does not alter the significance of this reception.

So much for the diagnosis. What of the future? Heiler's most important essay is called "The whole Christ of the whole Church." His dominant thought is that a disunited Church must have an impoverished conception of Christ. The way to reunion lies through recognition of the main result of New Testament criticism, namely that the New Testament is not a unity but a *complexio oppositorum*. The main tendencies of the primitive Church reappear in the Church today, but not together in any single communion. That the Roman Church is Petrine needs no arguing. The Eastern Church is Johannine, Evangelicalism at its best is Pauline. When all allowance has been made for St. Paul's sacramentalism, the Epistle to the Galatians remains the charter of Evangelicalism. Three practical steps to reunion are suggested. (i.) The way of Conference, but not after the manner of Lausanne, where *as briefly as possible* was the Chairman's watchword. The Council of Trent was better advised so far as length was concerned! (ii.) The cultivation of the Franciscan spirit. Heiler gives a fascinating account of the recent Franciscan movement among the French Protestants, led by M. Wilfrid Monod, and the still more recent Lutheran movement in which he himself has taken a great part; also of the relations between Protestant and Catholic Franciscans. (iii.) The third way is that of prayer. If the Pope repels us, we must turn the other cheek. We must never forget that Rome has saved belief in the Incarnation in the modern world. The Lutheran Tertiaries' prayer for the Pope is "that he as servant of God's servants may become all things to all men and as angelic pastor may feed the whole flock of Christ." Further, since Roman Catholics will not come to us, we must go to them. No papal ban forbids our worshipping with them. Only so can brotherly love and union of hearts arise, only so can the circumference of Romanism be influenced by our inflowing waves of

love. And if the circumference is warmed, the centre cannot remain permanently unaffected.

We are far from such a programme in England. It is hard to say whether Protestantism or official Anglicanism would find the last suggestion more unpalatable. I take it that Heiler would envisage a parish priest and some of his flock making a formal visit to a Roman Catholic Church in order to pray with fellow-Christians who are forbidden to pray with us—going in a spirit of humility and love, and with perfect loyalty to the faith as this Church and Realm has received it. Would the Roman authorities continue to quote Margaret Clitheroe's words in their entirety?

Surely Heiler is absolutely right in holding that until such visits are possible formal conferences between leaders are liable to do more harm than good. I hope that his book will be widely read in England and that, reduced to a more humble state of mind, Anglicans will say and think less about their own communion as a bridge-church. In spite of Heiler's strictures, God may yet mean us to be a bridge-church. But let us leave others to work out the idea. At present we dare not, if we know our imperfections as we should, aspire to a destiny so glorious.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

CHRISTIANS IN CHINA BEFORE THE YEAR 1550. By A. C. Moule.
London. S.P.C.K. 15s.

The fault of Chinese learning and literature to us Europeans is that it is a world to itself. It has little contact with things and movements that naturally interest us, apart from quite modern questions of trade and politics. One has vaguely heard of Marco Polo and Cathay, but Chinese history as a whole has little contact with ordinary "history," especially Church history. Mr. Moule's book does a great deal to fill the gap. Its plan has been to gather into one volume the available evidence for the existence of Christians in China before 1500, and to give in English the actual words of the original authorities in every case.

In the first chapter we find a careful examination of such traditions as there are which point to Christian missions in China before A.D. 635, the date given for the mission of "A-lo-pen" in the famous Nestorian Monument. Mr. Moule shows that the evidence comes to very little indeed. In the second chapter the Monument itself is discussed at length. This is followed (pp. 52-57) by a careful translation of the MS. found by Professor Pelliot at Tun-huang near the extreme north-west frontier of China, a MS. which must have been written about

A.D. 800, only a few years before the Nestorian Monument was erected. It contains a poem which is nothing less than a Chinese translation of the Nestorian form of the *Gloria in excelsis*, as Dr. Mingana (now of Manchester) was the first to point out. The *Gloria in excelsis* in its Eastern form differs somewhat from what we are accustomed to in the West (see *Moule*, p. 57, note), and it needed one familiar with East Syrian forms of worship to identify the source of this Chinese "Hymn of the Brilliant Teaching." But there can be no doubt of the identification, although Chinese renderings of foreign expressions, sacred or secular, have always a curious sound to our Western ears. For instance, after the *Gloria* comes a confession of faith in the Trinity which there is no reason to consider unorthodox: "We reverently worship the mysterious person the royal Father *A-lo-hē*, the responding person the royal Son *Mi-shih-hē*, the witnessing person *Lu-hē ning-chü-sha*: the above three persons unite together in one body." Mr. Moule gives reasons in a note (p. 55) for regarding the third name as a transcription of the Syriac *Ruha da-Qudsha* (the Holy Spirit). But in a language where "George" is written either *Ho-chi* (p. 49) or *I-ho-chi-ssü* (p. 55) or *K'uo-li-chi-ssü* (p. 236) almost anything is possible.*

The *Gloria* is followed by Mr. Moule's description of yet another ancient Chinese document, also from Tun-huang, which actually contains a Life of Christ (pp. 59-64). It is a very curious piece, and makes one wonder what "hearers of the word," as thus set forth, would think of our Lord and His story!

By about the year A.D. 1000 this first wave of Christian missionary enterprise in China had spent itself, and Christianity was almost forgotten there. Possibly it had never had much success among the real Chinese, but was practically confined to Tatar tribesmen. Some of the Tatars were Christian, and in the thirteenth century the Nestorians had regained some ground in North China. There was in particular a King George, who was an adopted grandson of Chingis Khan, and who married in succession a granddaughter of Kubla Khan and a daughter of his successor Temur; he died in 1298, but while he lived Christianity flourished at Peking. There was even a chance while he lived that North China might have submitted to the Roman obedience, for King George befriended John of Monte Corvino, a Franciscan friar who had found his way to Peking about the year 1294. John was made Archbishop of "Cambalu" by Pope Clement V., and he lived and worked in

* In the list of names on p. 55 I should like to suggest that Ch'ien-yen may be *Shim-ōn* (= Peter), Na-ning-i *Ad-da-i*, and Min-yen *Mar-i* (= Addai and Mari).

and about Peking—Cambalu, Khan-baliq, are really other names for Peking—until his death in 1328.

Archbishop John, whose letters from China have been preserved, was a capable and energetic man. He held his own, both against "idolaters" and the non-Roman Nestorians, but after his day Christianity declined. The Nestorians of the fourteenth century seem to have had little religious force, and the Roman Mission did not take root. Two years before John died his coadjutor, Andrew of Perugia, also a Franciscan, writes that the friars were able to preach freely and unmolested. "But," he adds, "of the Jews and Saracens none is converted. Of idolaters a very large number are baptized, but having been baptized they do not walk straight in the path of Christianity" (p. 195).

With the fall of the Mongol dynasty in 1368 Christianity in China collapsed, both of the Roman and the Nestorian variety. It seems to have had no success with the Chinese population, only among the Tatar invaders, who had more or less brought it with them. It is therefore, from the Christian point of view, a somewhat melancholy tale that Mr. Moule has had to tell. His book is based on such historical documents as still survive that deal with the early attempts to bring the Gospel to China. Some are in Latin, also Italian and Portuguese; some in Syriac; some in Chinese, not all it seems in the accepted classical style. It is Mr. Moule's great merit that he has succeeded in bringing these heterogeneous elements all together, and so giving us in a single volume the materials from which we can sketch the varied fortunes of these missionary efforts. As I said at the beginning, Chinese learning is a world in itself, and few European Chinese scholars have the energy or the inclination to investigate the heresies of Outer Barbarians—Professor Pelliot, indeed, is an honourable exception. The present writer, alas! is not a Chinese scholar, but it is much to be hoped that some competent Sinologist will examine Mr. Moule's work from the Chinese point of view. In particular it would be interesting to know how far the whole Christian movement in China before A.D. 1500 was confined to foreign, though at that time victorious, barbarians, and whether any effect of it can be traced in native Chinese literature or thought.

Since writing the above there has come to my notice a supplement to Mr. Moule's book, consisting of a list of the Chinese words, both in Chinese characters and transliteration, printed by the Commercial Press, Ltd., Shanghai. The list will be found useful by any Chinese scholar who reads *Christians in China*.

F. C. BURKITT.

STUDIES OF THE SPANISH MYSTICS. Vol. II. By Professor E. Allison Peers. Sheldon Press. 18s.

Professor Peers ought to be a very happy man. When in 1924 he published his *Spanish Mysticism: A Preliminary Survey*, he was like a prospector who, having discovered a rich gold-bearing reef, stood wondering whether his pick and shovel and the strength of his arm would suffice to dislodge any adequate quantity of the precious metal.

In the intervening years Professor Peers has performed prodigious feats of industry, and the treasure which he has made accessible is very great.

The first volume of *Studies of the Spanish Mystics*, which was published in 1927, contained biographical and critical notes on seven of the most important spiritual writers of the "Golden Age." In the second volume, which is even larger than the first, the lives and works of thirteen mystics are examined. It is a fine achievement.

Some idea of the toil involved in compiling the books may be gained by turning to the Bibliography. These mystics appear to have been amazingly prolific. For instance, 445 works were attributed to Jerónimo Gracián, and each of the other twelve was the author of books both long and numerous.

If all these many works had been brought out in modern Spanish and all to be found in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, much time and energy would still have been required to master them all. They are, however, scattered in various libraries—public, private, university, monastic—all up and down Spain; while some are only to be found in libraries abroad. Some of the books are in manuscript or in old editions probably hard to decipher. Professor Peers must have needed much enthusiasm, combined with rare tact and knowledge of the Spanish character, to succeed in persuading lay or monkish guardians of these treasures to allow him to enter their libraries and touch and study what he would.

Until Professor Peers began his labours, next to nothing of Spanish Mysticism was known in England. Three hundred years ago the writings of Luis de Granada were read in this country, but he has been long since forgotten. It was assumed that the age of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross had produced no mystics but these two, which is as preposterous as assuming that the Elizabethan age had produced no worthy playwright but Shakespeare. For the great never appear in isolation, but are the brightest stars in a galaxy.

There is now a growing interest in other religious writers of the epoch. Don Juan Mascaró, a young compatriot of Ramón Lull, lecturing last term at Oxford on Spanish Literature, chose

the Spanish Mystics as his subject. Professor Madariaga, of the same University, is of opinion that the literary value of many of the mystical writers is high, and encourages students to read them in the original, for their literary as well as for their religious value.

Professor Peers believes that a study of Spanish history implies a study of its mysticism.

"Her early national story," he wrote in his Preliminary Survey, "is that of age-long devotion to an ideal" (the ideal, of course, of a Christian Spain), "and in such an atmosphere mysticism breathes its native air."

An interest, then, in Spanish history and literature, no less than in general mysticism, should bring readers to Professor Peer's book.

All the mystics of whom he treats are worthy of attention, so that it is difficult to single out one rather than another for particular mention.

Many of them were astonishingly precocious. St. Peter of Alcántara inflicted "incredible austerities on himself almost from babyhood." "At four years of age," says a chronicler, "he would walk to the oratory, adoring his Creator in spirit and in truth; on entering it he would kneel and repeat his prayers without moving; he would do reverence with repeated genuflexions to the image, and, like another David, pour out his spirit before God." While in meditation the devout little boy would forget his meals.

It was this same Peter who exercised a deep influence over St. Teresa and, after his death, appeared to her more than once and gave her ghostly counsel.

Juan Falconi was a professed religious at the age of fifteen, and many of the others took the habit when they were no more than twenty.

The most attractive, to my mind, of these thirteen is Bernardino di Laredo, the doctor mystic. He had studied medicine at Paris and Seville, and was so attached to science that he wrote medical treatises when over fifty. He abandoned medicine as a profession at the age of twenty-eight, and became a lay-brother in the Franciscan monastery of San Francisco del Monte, near Seville. Here, while acting as apothecary to the friars, he wrote *The Ascent of Mount Sion*, a spiritual treatise of great charm, which St. Teresa was quick to admire and to use. *The Ascent of Mount Sion*, as its author says, "contains the knowledge of ourselves and the following of Christ and the reverencing of God in quiet contemplation," and in it a true Quietism is taught.

Bernadino is also interesting in having considered the good

effects that peace in the soul must have on the body. Professor Peers says "he clearly considers religion and medicine as complementary means of healing."

Readers who admire St. Ignatius will turn most eagerly to the chapter on García de Cisneros, where is fully discussed the question as to how far his *Exercises* influenced the more famous *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius.

Teresans will study particularly the sections on St. Peter of Alcántara and on Jerónimo Gracián, whose life makes thrilling if painful reading. Gracián was one of St. Teresa's stoutest champions.

Where the whole book is so valuable, any unfavourable criticism seems unkind. Yet it must be added that Professor Peers' wish to treat all his mystics alike and in the same manner has led to a certain monotony. Had he been a little less judicial, a little more partisan, a little more picturesque, his work would have gained in vividness and appeal.

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

NOTICES

PRAYER AND ITS PSYCHOLOGY. By Alexander Hodge, Ph.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This book consists of three parts, the first being primarily concerned with anthropology, the second with psychology and the last with metaphysics. Defining prayer as "intercourse with an ideal Being or Beings, conceived as objectively existent, superior, personal, and responsive," the author seeks to trace its evolution. He maintains that prayer is a universal and general concomitant of religion, of which it is the natural expression, and that it is a mistake to suppose that it is derived invariably from the spell. It frequently deteriorates into spell, and, on the other hand, the spell may develop into real supplication, but what evidence there is suggests a common origin for both. "Both religion and magic have their source in the primitive response to forces experienced as being greater than human. The development of prayer may be traced from the earliest cries of men through the simple, eudæmonistic, and social worship of tribal religion, to the individualistic prayers of the great universal religions."

In the specifically psychological part of the book, the author analyzes prayer into its cognitive, volitional, and affective elements, and briefly examines it from these points of view. While rejecting the theory that there is a specific religious instinct, he somewhat inconsistently admits that "prayer is instinctive at root," and he examines in some detail the relation of prayer to the three main groups of primary instincts—namely, those designed to promote the welfare of the individual, of the race, and of the herd respectively. In connection with the attempt to explain prayer away as mere auto-suggestion, it is clearly shown that while there is in fact no such thing as mere auto-suggestion, and while it is true that much

prayer is carried out in a state of suggestibility, it is also true that the particular species of prayer which is best summed up in the term "wrestling" does not conform to this type at all.

The philosophical and concluding section of the book seeks to vindicate the existence of the soul and the reality of a personal God. It traverses once more the well-trodden theme of the relation of mind and body, and passes on to consider the question, much canvassed in these days, how far anthropomorphism invalidates the theistic hypothesis.

One cannot rightly demand of a book of some two hundred pages that it should attempt to cover the whole field of the psychology of prayer, and in that portion with which Dr. Hodge deals he is a trustworthy and interesting guide. It is, however, unfortunate that he does not pay more attention to what has been said on the subject by the great writers on mystical and ascetical theology. In the lengthy bibliography, for example, not a single one of the classical treatises on prayer is mentioned, nor is any account taken of them in the text.

L. DEWAR.

PATHWAYS TO CERTAINTY. By W. Adams Brown, D.D. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

The justification of such a book as this is that fresh statements of the grounds of theistic belief, intended for the general public, are continually needed as the opposition changes its weapons. Contemporary American "humanism," in its non-theistic forms, is one of the latest variations on the agnostic theme. With its insistence on the reality of human values it is no crass materialism. It claims to be a spiritual movement, and stresses the importance of religion. But the religion must be a natural piety directed towards man's highest ideals and aspirations; the supernatural God of the theist is rejected as being beyond the reach of "scientific" knowledge. It is with an eye to this opinion and also to the drift away from supernatural religion in general that Dr. Adams Brown has indicated once more, and in very readable form, the rational ground for believing in the existence of God.

It is a sane, calm book, the work of a judicious mind with a wide range of sympathy. There is little or nothing new in it, but it presents its arguments with an effective lucidity and competence.

Two familiar sophistries—that only what can be verified by mathematical and quantitative tests can be taken as sure, and that the non-rational factors in the psychological process of forming beliefs vitiate the doctrines of religion—are treated first with temperate judgment. The need for religious conviction, as the condition of effective living, is urged in terms that recall the impressive argument of Mr. Christopher Dawson's excellent *Progress and Religion*: "Loss of conviction . . . is the most serious thing that can happen to a society, for unless the lost conviction is speedily replaced by a better, the entire edifice will disintegrate and chaos will be the result. That is why the present eclipse of religious faith is so disturbing. In losing God men are losing more than a particular belief. They are losing the standards that until yesterday gave definiteness to their views on art and on politics, on education and on morals. Where this loss occurs fellowship in any large sense becomes increasingly difficult, for men have no longer anything worth while to share."

The main subject then follows. Dr. Adams Brown discusses four "pathways to certainty," which are found *mutatis mutandis* in science

as well as in religion—authority, intuition, reasoning, and experiment. Revelation is regarded not as a fifth way, but as “our way of expressing our conviction that in each of the four ways God is speaking to us, and that no account of His ways of revealing Himself can be complete which does not take them all in.” There is a sympathetic study of authority in religion, defending its rightful place and the just claims of the Bible and the Church on mind and heart. Oddly enough, this American Presbyterian scholar is far more satisfactory in his treatment of Biblical and ecclesiastical authority than in what he says of the authority of Jesus. Our Lord is set forth as authoritative in three ways. He is the “clearest illustration” of a “life of sympathetic goodwill,” of “the kind of spirit that must prevail if the life of love is ever to be realized,” and of “the resources on which we must rely.” That is well enough as far as it goes; but it goes no farther. There is not a word about the Kingdom brought by Christ or His Messiahship in the discussion of His authority. The whole section is an unfortunate example of that kind of humanitarian liberalism which is now being rejected on all sides by New Testament scholars as radically unhistorical.

The “way of intuition,” or mystical religion, is presented as the confirmation and interpretation of other knowledge. But we imagine that St. John of the Cross or St. Teresa would not have had much patience with a description of mysticism which includes the statement that God is “only to be realized in the incommunicable thrill that comes to the worshipper who surrenders himself completely to his spell in the silence of the Spirit.” There are some useful pages on the mystical elements in science, art, and ethics.

In chapter v., where the author deals with the way of reasoning, we get a valuable restatement of the traditional arguments for the existence of God, and some excellent reflections on the strange delusion, often met with in contemporary writings, that the vast expanse of the universe, revealed by modern astronomy, creates a serious new problem for Christian believers. Here is one of a number of passages where the massive common sense of the author effectively dissipates patches of contemporary fog.

The remainder of the argument, dealing with the religious life as the progressive verification of the religious hypothesis, is on familiar lines, but not the less worth reading for that. A bibliography, divided according to the chapters, and rather miscellaneous in character, is added at the end of the book.

The book can be confidently recommended to the large public for which the Student Christian Movement publications are designed, as a persuasive statement of the arguments for theism, though, as we have said, we cannot regard its references to our Lord as satisfactory.

H. BALMFORTH.

THE PROBLEM OF RIGHT CONDUCT. By Peter Green, M.A. Longmans. 6s.

This valuable book marks a new stage in Anglican Moral Theology. Now for the first time the whole field of Christian Ethics is covered—at least in outline—in one handbook. Specialized training is not presupposed, and the style is direct, forcible and lucid. The illustrations come vividly from the wide experience of a parish priest. The whole outlook of the book is Anglican. No Roman Catholic works are mentioned either in the review of the principal schools of ethics or in the bibliography.

It is in no sense a manual for confessors, and nowhere contemplates the specific problems of giving or withholding absolution. The moral ideal is positive and progressive, and is built up independently of the traditional distinction between Moral and Ascetic Theology.

The independence of Roman work is the more striking because Canon Green's basis is exactly theirs. Many of the problems might have been dealt with more expeditiously and decisively by reference to the moral philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas and his modern interpreters.

Canon Green first establishes the scope of ethics and routs the deniers of our freedom. He then reviews the chief lines of ethical thought as an introduction to his thesis that every ethics rests upon a philosophy of human nature, and therefore that Christian ethics rests upon the Christian doctrine of Man and cannot be a mere superficial finish to an ethics fundamentally other. Following a threefold exposition of man as individual, as social and as spiritual, Canon Green deals with our duties to self, to our neighbour and to God.

This positive ideal is far more effective than the philosophical search for human nature. There one knows exactly what is coming. The appeal very soon becomes the appeal to man's "true" or "ideal" nature. It is not to man "as he is," but "as he is capable of becoming" (p. 95). "We certainly have not a complete and final idea of man's nature. . . . But we have some idea" (p. 88). Hence the next page seems to follow inevitably. "The Christian philosopher could reply to the charge that he is arguing in a circle . . . that in Jesus we have an example of perfect man ready to our hand. This is of course true" (p. 89). The "could" suggests other possible replies, but none are given, and this is Canon Green's real basis. He would have done much better to have cut out the whole discussion of "nature." Two passages show how useless this slippery word is. "Anger, the most common and *in one sense* natural of sins, is really and truly foreign to man's true nature" (p. 104). Again, "In simple and primitive states of society men and women live really natural" lives . . . whereas "conditions of modern life are essentially unnatural" (pp. 224 and 235). In every case italics, inverted commas and question-begging adverbs have to help it out. None of the causes so finely urged (such as education without fear, sport without cruelty, or adventure without gambling) get any help at all from this criterion. It solves no problems of Property or Interest, for here the "moral" or the "ethical" is contrasted with the "economical." Hence when as a philosopher Canon Green says, "A man who refuses to recognize an obligation to obey the laws of his own being, or to seek his own highest good, stands self-confessed as a fool" (p. 93), we resent such blustering. When as a prophet he summons us to make the Fulness of Christ our ideal, we are deeply stirred.

Under present circumstances adultery is a ground for divorce *a vinculo* and need not be a fatal bar to communion. Surprisingly, after defending ethics as probationary and this life as a vale of soul-making, and after emphatically giving the law of soul-making as the Cross (*cp.* "The doctrine of sacrifice . . . must go to the very roots of human conduct. This, the way of sacrifice, must be *the* way," p. 146), Canon Green would allow suicide "under due restrictions."

J. C. WEST.

INNOCENT I. By L. Elliott Binns, D.D. Methuen and Co. 6s. net.

This is the first volume of a new series on Great Medieval Churchmen, under the general editorship of Dr. Binns. If the succeeding numbers come up to the level of the present work, we shall be fortunate in acquiring a valuable addition to English studies of medieval Church history. The method of treatment is popular but scholarly. There is no parade of learning and little documentation, but an occasional note reveals a wealth of recondite knowledge. Indeed, to the advanced student the notes will be the most interesting part of the book.

Dr. Binns does not give us a strict biography of Innocent, but a series of character studies drawn from various points of view. Thus in one chapter Innocent is seen as the Italian prince, in another as the vicegerent of Christ, in another as the guardian of orthodoxy, and so on. This presentation of a "subject" in a number of snapshots performs for us one inestimable service: it enables us to see a personality clearly and to see it whole. In this case the sum total of our impressions gives us as vivid a picture of the great Pope as is conveyed by the mosaic portrait which Dr. Binns has chosen for his frontispiece. But, of course, this way of doing things has inevitable limitations. For instance, it is almost impossible for the beginner to get a clear conspectus of the chronology. A few dates collected together in an appendix would have obviated this difficulty. Again, while we get the portrait, we do not get the background. Here, too, the frontispiece is a curiously faithful prophecy of the contents of the book. And this is more serious because these books are meant to view their subjects, not in isolation, but as contributing to the Church's life and thought at some particular epoch. We hope that future writers will endeavour to paint the background for us in contemporary events and conditions before they bring out the particular features of their hero. A still further limitation is the possibility that between these different views some one important aspect may escape due notice. In this case we should have liked to see a more adequate treatment of Innocent's relations with the mendicant orders. Indeed, we are not sure that, in view of subsequent history, these relations were not the most fruitful element of all his pontificate. Whether the Pope knew it or not, the Franciscan movement meant the detachment of the ascetic spirit from the somewhat aloof and aristocratic circles of monasticism and the attempt to introduce it into every home. It had thus a profound influence upon the development of Christian ethics. That influence passed into the sects of the post-Reformation period and is still fighting for its life today.

But these criticisms apart—and a reviewer must criticize something—we are very grateful to Dr. Binns for an eminently readable volume and to the publishers for an enterprise which promises us much delightful reading for the future.

J. C. W. WAND.

THE MIND OF CHRIST IN PAUL. By Frank Chamberlin Porter. Charles Scribner's Sons. 8s. 6d.

Dr. Porter is an American scholar, best known in this country from his articles in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. This volume contains lectures delivered by him at Yale on the Nathaniel W. Taylor foundation in 1929. The main thesis of the book is that, so far from St. Paul being

responsible for the corruption of primitive Christianity, he is rather the supreme witness to both the historicity and character of Jesus. "Paul's testimony to what Jesus was . . . is found not only in what he directly says about Jesus, but also in what he would have his disciples become, and in what he is conscious that he himself is 'in Christ.'" The point is developed at length with skill and sympathy. This part of the book will win the consent of all Christians.

But intermixed with this theme is the writer's inveterate hostility to any attempt to frame a theological interpretation of the person of Christ. Christians are to be content to know Him in personal experience, and in the likeness of character that results from the impact of Christ upon their lives. The influence of Greek thought upon Christianity is treated as wholly bad. "Theology is a Greek word for a Greek thing." When the tendency to theology appeared at Corinth, St. Paul hastened to correct it. "Greek philosophy he evidently thought of as man's unaided search for God; just as Jewish legalism was man's effort after a righteousness of his own." Any identification of Jesus with the Logos is out of harmony with St. Paul's view. 1 Cor. viii. 6 is held to be a quotation from the Corinthian letter, due to the unfortunate influence of Apollos, which by a piece of very doubtful exegesis St. Paul is made to deprecate. Col. i. 15-17 may perhaps be a quotation from a current hymn, which he immediately proceeds to rectify, but is more probably an interpolation. In his discussion of this passage, it is strange that he makes no mention of the article by Dr. Burney arguing that the whole of this part of the epistle is a Rabbinical expansion of texts of Genesis. So, too, Phil. ii. 6-11 is treated as a quotation out of harmony with St. Paul's real thought. Any idea of pre-existence is condemned as separating Christ from us.

Enough has been said to show that on this side the book represents a rejection of all metaphysical thinking, and an attempt to regard Christ as in some sense having the value of God, which is now strangely old-fashioned. Those who wish to read a clear and scholarly exposition of such a view will find it in these pages, but few will agree with the methods of interpretation of the text by which it is supported. It may be a matter of regret that the Greeks raised philosophical questions about the person of Christ, but it is plain that they had to be met by some kind of philosophical answers. Nor can we evade the question that lies behind the Colossian controversy, whether the God revealed in Christ is one with the God revealed in the universe. Perhaps the greatest value of a book of this kind is to reveal the impossibility of a religion without theology, and the recognition of this impossibility as early as St. Paul.

E. J. BICKNELL.

SIMON THE ZEALOT. By L. S. Hoyland, M.A. Williams and Norgate.
7s. 6d.

The substance of this book, written by a member of the Society of Friends, was given in the form of lectures to an audience of young Indians, many of whom wore the white homespun of extreme Nationalism. Mr. Hoyland endeavours to describe in modern language the earthly life and teaching of our Lord from the point of view of an ardent Nationalist like St. Simon Zelotes. He claims to give an accurate account of the state of feeling among the Jews of our Lord's time, when the great mass

of the people were eagerly expecting a Messiah who would drive out the Romans by force of arms and establish an earthly kingdom. Again and again Jesus refused to countenance this expectation which the disciples seem to have shared (Matt. xx. 21 *ff.*; Acts i. 6). In the end, after the bitter disappointment of Palm Sunday, the Jews crucified their King. The book is not intended for scholars, but for popular reading. It is written in an attractive style. Sometimes the author lets his imagination run away with him. The home at Bethany was surely not "a biggish establishment" ruled by Martha, "a good lady with a tongue like a file," with which on occasion she "lashed the servants"! But the book achieves its object, which is to drive home the lesson—needed now as much as in our Lord's day—that Christ's kingdom is not of this world.

H. W. FULFORD.

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND. An Introduction to the Study of its History. By G. C. Binyon. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

This is a disappointing book. We hasten to add that it is not Mr. Binyon's fault that his very full and conscientious record lacks inspiration: it is rather the fault of the movement which he chronicles. It has been a strangely successful attempt to convert the leaders of the Church of England to the principles of what is vaguely called "Christian Socialism," and it has achieved a result which would have been very surprising to its early pioneers. This conquest appears to date from 1910, when the semi-official Pan-Anglican Congress Papers embodied the principles for which Bishop Gore and the C.S.U. prophets had contended in the preceding quarter of a century. Indeed, it was one of these pamphlets which Dr. Hensley Henson described as "a clever Christian Socialist tract." The high-water mark of the success of the Christian Socialist propaganda was reached in 1916 with the publication of the Report of the Archbishops' Fifth Committee, and the establishment of the I.C.F. to popularize its principles.

Yet the movement has left the majority of Churchmen singularly undisturbed. They are prepared to applaud at public gatherings such sentiments as "If Christ is lord at all, He must be lord of all," but beyond such conventional assent, there is no very deep stirring of opinion, either of enthusiasm or of opposition.

Mr. Binyon puts his finger on the cause of this apathy when he points out that the older Christian Socialist vessel was torpedoed by two theological flotillas. The first may be dated from the publication of Schweitzer's eschatological theory, which seemed to many to divest the Gospels of any sort of interest in social concerns. The second was the popularization by Dr. O'Brien and others of the researches of scholars into the economics of the mediæval thinkers. It came as a revelation to many that the Church possessed its own economic theory and had thought out, under mediæval conditions, the principle of the Just Price and other deductions from Christian ethics. The consequence was that some who had seen in the Gospel the warrant for a Tolstoyan type of Christianity were left perplexed, while others who had supposed that the Socialist programme was the only proposal consistent with Christianity found that the Church had her own independent sociology. These two currents of thought detached the Evangelical and the Anglo-Catholic elements re-

spectively, but it is by no means certain that they represent the last word on the subject. The belief that there was anything like a complete Christian Sociology in the Middle Age would not now be seriously entertained.

The present position of the Christian Social Movement is candidly summed up by Bishop Gore in his Halley Stewart Lectures for 1927: "We are by no means satisfied with the progress of our cause. . . . And in part the cause of this disappointment is to be found in the vagueness of our own ideas, and the consequent uncertainty as to our methods and our objective."

What is to be the way out of this uncertainty cannot be predicted, but Mr. Maurice Reckitt has indicated not obscurely that opposition may crystallize principles at present vaguely held in solution. The Faith is at present neither persecuted nor acknowledged, but merely respected, and that is not an atmosphere which challenges its teachers to work out their principles.

M. DONOVAN.

THE MYSTIC WILL. Based on a study of the Philosophy of Jacob Boehme.
By Howard Brinton, Ph.D. Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 8s. 6d.

All students of mysticism have heard of Jacob Boehme, but few indeed have studied his work. The figure of "the inspired shoemaker" is an attractive one. That a peasant's son, who had received no other education but what the village school could give, should set himself to solve the combined problems of Theology and Natural Science is wonderful enough. Still more wonderful is the fact that the working shoemaker, in the intervals of plying his craft, did actually succeed in evolving a mystical philosophy which not only satisfied his own soul and the souls of his disciples, but which has stood the test of time remarkably well.

Unfortunately, however, his language is so obscure and his symbolism so complicated that a modern reader will admit that Boehme is a remarkable man, without having the perseverance to discover what claims to genius he may actually possess. Dr. Brinton has done a great service to students by sifting the wheat from the chaff and by setting out lucidly and pleasantly whatever in Boehme's writings is of permanent value. Boehme was hampered by the formalism of Lutheran Theology and by the fantastic notions of Alchemy. Yet he displayed a real genius for speculative thought and an instinct for scientific truth which makes one feel how he would have delighted in the company of Eddington and Jeans.

His was an attempt to harmonize the two religious impulses in man; the impulse to look *outwards* from the self and, passing through multiplicity, to find God at the extreme limit of thought; and the impulse to look *inwards*, within the self, and there, by means of renunciation of the Many, to achieve unity with the One. Boehme believed that he had succeeded, and in success had achieved harmony and peace.

For many readers the most interesting chapter will be the one which deals with "the problem of practical mysticism," treating more of mysticism in general than of Boehme in particular. The whole book, however, is both scholarly and well written, and should be on the shelves of all who have a serious interest in philosophic or experimental mysticism.

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS AND THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON. By Lewis B. Radford, D.D., Bishop of Goulburn. Methuen. 21s.

This is a volume in the Westminster Commentaries, and follows the lines common to the series. The text commented on is that of the English Revised Version, and the commentary addresses itself, in Bishop Radford's words, "to students rather than scholars." The reader is presented with the results of critical study, but in a form which does not demand any linguistic or other technical knowledge. The author's first aim is to make the content of St. Paul's thought clear, and the balance of his interest inclines to such matters as have value for edification. That does not mean, however, that there has been anything slipshod in the scholarly preparation of the commentary. The bibliography, if not complete, is adequate, and the author has not spared the labour required to welding the fruits of his studies into a balanced and clear exposition.

There are 143 pages of introduction to Colossians, and 24 pages to Philemon, against 177 pages and 24 pages, respectively, of text and commentary. The latter is inclusive of "Additional Notes" on such subjects as Pleroma, Afflictions of Christ, House Congregations, and the like. The former comprises, besides the matter indispensable in an introduction, some more general discussion of the subjects peculiar to these two epistles, the type of religious development now represented by Theosophy, and the principles underlying the Christian attitude towards slavery.

In the light of recent researches on Anatolian religion, the "Colossian heresy," Bishop Radford says, now appears as something more local and limited than was formerly supposed. But this does not mean that the importance of the Epistle is diminished. The situation to be dealt with evoked, from the Apostle, a reply based upon principles of wide application, and with a present-day bearing, seeing that people still seek to enjoy the interest and consolations of Christian religion without acknowledging the absolute character of the claims of Christ.

It is a matter of special interest to know what were St. Paul's own beliefs as to the place of angels in the universe, and historically in the religious development of Israel. His language in this Epistle constitutes Marcion's strongest support for his antithesis between the world-order and the Kingdom of God, revealed in Christ. After reviewing the relevant passages, Bishop Radford rather surprisingly asserts (p. 100): "It is incredible that St. Paul still believed . . . that angels or demons had any real objective control over human life." But nothing in St. Paul's words hints that he is mentioning hypotheses which he does not himself accept. On the contrary, he saw in the incredulity of Israel as a whole a problem so dark as to require, for its solution, the disclosing of some spiritual mystery, in which a struggle of the Law-angels to retain their domination may well have been conceived as having a place. The description of Epaphras as "the founder" of the Church at Colossæ (p. 153) seems to assume a little more than the references justify. They do not exclude the possibility that others from outside Colossæ had a share in the planting of Christianity there.

But to frame criticisms of such a kind is indirect testimony to the general excellence of the book. Preachers and devotional students especially will find it full of good things, and need have no fears as to the soundness of the learning which it represents.

W. TELFER.

PHILOSOPHY AND THE CROSS. By O. C. Quick, D.D. Riddell Memorial Lectures. Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

This consists of two lectures delivered before the University of Durham at Armstrong College, Newcastle: (1) The Cross in Relation to Metaphysical Theory, (2) The Cross in Relation to Moral Theory. It departs from that restricted view of the task of theology which keeps in isolation the special problems of biblical and historical Christianity and the more abstract and general features of life and thought—in this it sets an example which those who recognize the universality of the task of religious philosophy might, at least from time to time, follow with advantage. The abstract principle of the Cross is deeply involved in the conditions of gaining intellectual and moral integrity. It is the clash between the order of value and "the orders of logic and fact" which imposes self-denial as the condition of appreciation "of the highest good which is one with ultimate reality." This main theme is worked out in relation to scientific determinism. There is a valuable section on the danger of claims to infallibility—"in principle all doctrines of infallibility are either rejections or misapplications of the law of the Cross in the intellectual sphere." (The whole section in which this occurs should be read: "To desire so earnestly to know God's world as it is, to be so convinced that the knowledge is worth the cost, that one is willing to go to school in and with the world, without imposing upon it his preconceived ideas of what it ought to be—that surely is the *amor intellectualis Dei* which Christ Himself would praise.")

In the second lecture self-sacrifice as the expression of the highest good revealed in our experience finds in the Cross the means whereby the spatio-temporal world is so transformed as to come within an eternal heavenly order. The value of this little book is out of all proportion to its size, and it is a good example of emancipation from that overstressed specialization to which it is so easy to fall a victim. Now and again a striking sentence illuminates a whole situation—e.g., "Mr. Walter Lippmann . . . ought surely to have entitled his book, not *A Preface*, but rather *An Epitaph, to Morals*"; and "The true intellectual sacrifice does not consist in cutting reason's throat with the knife of revelation."

F. W. BUTLER.

AN ANGLICAN USE. By Horace Spence. With a Foreword by the Archbishop of York. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The Chamberlain of York Minster has added to the many services which that great Church is now rendering to the Anglican Communion by putting out an extremely useful little book. Having observed that very nearly all Christian people, whatever their theology, desire that there should be beauty and dignity in the worship of God, and that they further desire a "simple," that is, an intelligible, ceremonial, he suggests five possible grades of Service, which have the merit of being variations and developments of one single theme. He gives instructions which would suffice for a priest celebrating alone without a server, and also for four other more elaborate types of service. The position and most of the actions of the celebrant are identical in all of them.

Mr. Spence skilfully tries to avoid doctrinal difficulties. It is indeed quite true, as he says, that ceremonial is for the most part utilitarian.

There is something to be done, and ceremonial rubrics suggest ways of doing it. But some problems do remain. Thus there is "the British Museum School," of which I confess myself a rather ignorant and rather eclectic disciple. He would probably consider the devotees of the English Use in its strict form to be too pedantic. At all events he passes by a good many of their contentions in silence. In another direction he offers no opinion about the propriety of interpolating prayers, silent or semi-audible, into the liturgy, or of altering the positions which have been traditional among us for the *Gloria in Excelsis* or the Ablutions. Again he is naturally unable to find room in his expanding scheme for priests who stand at the North End. Thus he does not cover all the ground, and, though he is himself eminently sensible, he overrates the reasonableness of some who will be in the congregations that he envisages. But prejudice is waning, and, inasmuch as the great majority of the clergy are not blessed, or cursed, with any very exact historical or constitutional theory, but are eager to do their work with a more careful, more intelligent devotion, Mr. Spence's book will do admirable service. Where there are strong liturgical convictions, it will be put on one side. Where there is vagueness, and willingness to learn, it will be welcome.

S. C. CARPENTER.

SIN AND THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY. By C. E. Barbour. Allen and Unwin. 6s.

Sin, someone has said, is "not only a tragedy to the individual, but a nuisance to the systematic thinker." Not to Dr. Barbour, however, who has tidier views on the subject than any writer we know. This tendency to over-schematization accounts for both the merits and the weaknesses of this book, though we may say at once that the latter are not of great importance. The author's underlying purpose is to show that "in a general way the aims of the new psychology and the aims of Christianity are the same. Both seek abundant life for the individual and ideal social life for the group": his book "is not an apologetic for the Christian doctrine of sin, but an effort to show that no such apologetic is necessary. Psychology, like the other sciences, has merely added the weight of its evidence to prove the eternal verity of the doctrines of Christ." It is obvious that, to prove this thesis, the author must in the first place ignore the Behaviourists altogether, and, in the second, must show that the implications, for Christian theology, of the psychological doctrines of (e.g.) Freud and Jung are frequently the very opposite of what their teachers suppose them to be. This apparently paradoxical result Dr. Barbour does successfully achieve. He is not, of course, the first writer to do so: but nowhere else, perhaps, will the student find so full and satisfactory a discussion of the bearing of current psychologies of the "dynamic" type on the various aspects of the Christian idea of sin; and we cordially welcome a volume for which there was a real need. We wish Dr. Barbour had made clearer the distinctions between Original Sin, Moral Disease, Actual Sin, and what we should call *mixed states*. It seems to us of great importance to recognize that both the psycho-therapist and the minister of religion are dealing, in most cases, with the last named. There is an element of sin in all moral disease which is *acquired*: on the other hand, we never meet cases of "sheer" sin, undiluted by that *inherited* moral disease which theologians call Original Sin. Recidivism,

pathological lying, and scrupulosity are cases in point. The book has no index, and the (abundant) quotations from authorities are unaccompanied by any references to the pages, or even to the chapters, of the works quoted, a maddening omission to any reader who wants to consult the authority further.

C. E. HUDSON.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE 1928 LITURGY. By H. T. Knight. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

Canon Knight has had the happy idea of bringing together within the compass of a small book the liturgical evidence of the New Testament and of early Church History, with some account of the work accomplished in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and then using all this information to illustrate the 1928 Revision. He arranges his historical facts accurately and concisely, so that even the inexperienced reader will have acquired a reasonably clear idea of the characteristics of a primitive liturgy, and the meaning of "Eastern," "Western," and the more essential technical terms. He then analyzes the latest Revision and shows that it exhibits, to an extent to which its various critics did less than justice, the features of Catholic antiquity. A characteristic paragraph is:

"The Invocation is not in itself an Oriental element. What is distinctively Eastern is to stress it as representing the moment of Consecration, just as to emphasize similarly the words of Institution is distinctive of Western tradition. But Catholicism claims to represent and embody that which is common to East and West; and the primitive Use—as we now know—regarded the whole prayer, and the prayer as a whole, as constituting the Consecration. If a moment or word has to be stressed, it is the 'Amen' with which the congregation present expresses its ratification of the priest's words and acts."

A table at the end of the book sets side by side the primitive norm, and the Liturgies of 1549, 1662, 1927.

S. C. CARPENTER.

THE REFORMATION, CATHOLICISM, AND FREEDOM. By J. W. Poynter. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Mr. Poynter has covered a remarkable amount of ground in the brief compass of two hundred pages. The problem which he sets himself is the general problem of liberty of conscience, and he marks the steps by which we have been led to the acceptance of that principle. The blocking out of his material in the disposition of the earlier chapters is a little confusing, but we come on to a consecutive history of toleration in Great Britain from 1688 to 1930, concluding with a very interesting survey of Roman Catholic organizations, missionary and propagandist, in this country. The Roman communion (of which the author was formerly a member) occupies the centre of the stage: and he writes of it without rancour, respecting its piety while deprecating its narrowness. His pages are too liberally studded with quotations from secondary authorities, many of them somewhat old-fashioned, though that indeed has much to recommend it: he conveys the impression that his reading has been more assiduous than nicely critical. But his work provides a useful handbook

to the period from the Albigensian persecution to the present day, and will prove serviceable to students who cannot undertake a more extensive investigation of the history of toleration in Great Britain. The Bishop of Gloucester contributes a magisterial preface, in which he condemns religious persecution and rebukes the Roman controversialists in England for bad manners.

C. H. SMYTH.

THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. By Fra Mattia Bellintani Da Salo. Sheed and Ward. 6s.

This is a book of deep spirituality which will delight and nourish many readers, though some will find themselves unable to read more than a few pages with interest. It consists of a course of Sermons preached in Milan Cathedral during Lent, 1597, discourses of prodigious length, whose carefully reasoned and intensely delivered theology would be beyond the understanding of most general congregations in present-day England, though still of intense interest to those who are in earnest in the spiritual life. They are saturated with Holy Scripture, intensely vivid, and satisfying to the mind as well as the heart and will. Fra Mattia is burning with the love of our Lord's Passion and filled with desire that every Christian should be united with those sacred sufferings, in order to apply their saving merits to his soul, and he seeks to move the whole man to devotion to Jesus crucified.

The translator is to be congratulated on the skill with which she has accomplished a difficult piece of work, and the publishers on an important addition to their library of "Capuchin Classics."

F. P. HARTON.

THOUGHTS ON SOME PROBLEMS OF THE DAY. By William, Archbishop of York. Macmillan. 4s. 6d. net.

This volume consists of the Charge delivered by the Archbishop at his primary visitation.

In the preface the author states that one legitimate function of an episcopal Charge is "to offer some contribution to the common stock of the Church's thought, of such a kind as to help clergy and laity of the diocese both to carry their own thinking further and to understand how their diocesan regards some of the questions that are under discussion. This has been my aim in the Charge now published."

The background of the Charge is the Lambeth Conference of last year, and the five chapters in which the Archbishop expresses his mind are entitled Christian Faith in God, The Church's Witness, Our Heritage in the Anglican Communion, Reunion and Validity, and Eucharistic Doctrine.

Many people will be grateful to him for having made what he has to say accessible to a wider public than his own *diocésains*. (This useful French word appears to have no single equivalent in English.) Since the death of Mandell Creighton it may be doubted whether there has been anyone in the Church with so sure a grasp of great principles and with such power of expounding them with perfect lucidity. I might add, with a sanity which is intensely and distinctively English, but never in the least insular.

As there does not appear to be a superfluous word in the book, it is really impossible to quote from it. Any extract, unless of inordinate length, would lose so much by being taken from its context that it might be completely misunderstood. I can only express a sincere hope that the volume will be read from end to end as widely and as carefully as it deserves.

One small point. The Archbishop may be right in thinking that some alteration in the customary hours of Divine Service on Sundays is desirable. But I do not think that his suggested time table would work well in town parishes. (I cannot speak for the country, and of course the diocese of York is mainly rural.) Presumably it is not expected that those who attend the 9 o'clock sung Eucharist will have breakfasted first, and to sing fasting is a matter of some difficulty—not less presumably in the country than in the town. Moreover, there are many people who prefer their Eucharist without music. They may be lacking in artistic perception, but they are entitled to some consideration. My own experience (for whatever it may be worth) is entirely against having Evensong at 5 p.m.

There are two appendices: one on Archbishop Lord Davidson, which is a sermon preached in Bishopthorpe Church on the Sunday after Ascension Day, 1930; and one on The Majesty of God, which is a sermon preached at the opening of the last Lambeth Conference. Lord Davidson would have occupied the pulpit had he been alive. It is unnecessary to say more than that both are on the same level as the earlier part of the book.

R. H. MALDEN.

CREATIVE WORSHIP. (Swarthmore Lecture, 1931.) By H. H. Brinton, Ph.D. Allen and Unwin. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WORSHIP. By Pleasance Moore-Browne, with a Preface by Archdeacon Storr. S.P.C.K. 1s.

SITTING FOR THE PSALMS. By Clement F. Rogers. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

The justification of worship on philosophical and scientific grounds is the aim of the writers of the first two of these booklets, and they each succeed in putting forward their particular theses with freshness and clarity. Dr. Brinton writes advocating the method of worship among Quakers from a metaphysical standpoint. He reminds us how deeply the mechanistic conception of the universe has affected the religious thought and worship of the Western world, and how much these still have to be modified by the newer organic theory. It is noteworthy that, though he has much to say about Puritan thought and worship and much about Quaker ways, he only takes a brief and almost frightened glimpse at the Catholic notion of worship. Many will, however, find in his book an eloquent apology for the Catholic method. It is true that Puritan culture has tended to produce a type of worship which is but a means to an end, an aid to a moral life; that it regards God mainly as a goal to be striven after, external and remote. It is true that the Friends have realized in a wonderful way an organic "creative" worship, that their waiting groups have been illuminated by the immanent Spirit of God, and that individual souls have been born again in these collective experiences—that for the Quaker worship is not a means to an end, but an end in itself. But the words of Christ are still valid: "Whosoever shall not receive the

Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein." This implies that our relation to ultimate Reality is both mechanistic and organic at the same time and that our worship must provide for this twofold relationship. Dr. Brinton says "in Catholic worship something happens which is important in itself." Here is the organic element. But the mechanistic element is present also, for in the Mass we do not only worship and experience God; we read about Him and hear about Him and sing praises to Him. In fact, as Dr. Brinton admits, Catholic worship "apprehends man as both natural and spiritual." It is because the Quaker scheme of worship "assumes that man is spiritual," and just that alone, that Quakerism can never be a universal religion.

Mrs. Moore-Browne, in her analysis of worship into three elements of past, present, and future, shows how essential to a complete worship the mechanistic element is, though she does not use this expression. Her book is a systematic application of the more or less assured results of modern psychological science to the problems of worship. Particularly valuable is her insistence upon the place of the unconscious (or extra-conscious) in worship, and on her sorting out true and false values in common liturgical practice. Her warnings on the danger of self-pity being mistaken for true religious feeling are specially needed. Her perplexity about the Catholic care for ceremonial is strange, since on reading her book one is led by her own arguments to see how important an element in public worship this is. This book and that of Dr. Brinton would each gain in value if they devoted more space to concrete examples of worship in accordance with their principles. Nevertheless they are both valuable and stimulating to those whose task is to order church services.

Professor Clement Rogers is severely practical. He makes a very detailed search into the history of posture during the Psalms, extracting evidence to support his thesis from all manner of remote places. Indeed, a suspicion hovers in the reader's mind that he heartily disliked the custom of sitting for the Psalms before he began his research to demonstrate its unhistorical character. One by one he impressively unveils a long row of portraits of ecclesiastics and divines who are nearly all observed to be frowning upon the worshipper who sits for the Psalms. But is the question one which is settled either way by the appeal to precedent? Granted that Professor Rogers' research is a really comprehensive one, is the result of such research to be the last word? Is not the matter principally a psychological one? Which posture, standing or sitting, is likely to lead to the most recollected participation in this section of the service? There are many who, from practical experience of both methods over long periods, undeterred by the reminder of St. Peter Damian (quoted by the author) that "Eli was sitting when he broke his neck," would still decide in favour of sitting for the Psalms.

D. C. DUNLOP.